





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761118953439>

CA20N
X1
-D23

29 90



29 90

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 7 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 7 mai 1990



Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 7 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Kormos: There is only one computerized axial tomography scanner in all of the Niagara Peninsula. As members well know, the need for CAT scanning is expected to grow rather than diminish, because CAT scanning is becoming the diagnostic tool of choice as we enter the 1990s.

Members should know that as a result of there only being one CAT scanner in Niagara, the average outpatient wait for a CAT scan for Niagara residents is almost five months, making it the longest wait for an elective CAT scan in the whole province. The waiting periods in Niagara exceeded the guidelines established by the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council as three days for inpatients and two weeks for outpatients as maximum waiting periods.

The need for new CAT scanner facilities in Niagara region has never been more evident and more urgent. It is recommended that there be the immediate establishment and operation of a second CAT scanner within Niagara, and the most appropriate location for that CAT scanner would be in Welland at the Welland County General Hospital.

The Niagara District Health Council was established in 1975 to advise the Minister of Health on the planning and co-ordination of health care services in Niagara region. It is its review, its examination of CAT scanning resources and requirements in the Niagara region, that gives us the information that I have given to members today. It is its recommendation that that second CAT scanner be installed in Niagara region. It is about time the Minister of Health started listening to her own advisory bodies.

ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION OF THE NETHERLANDS

Mr J. M. Johnson: Canada has a special place in the hearts of the people of Holland; 45 years ago, Canadian soldiers liberated the Netherlands after five years of occupation by the German army during the Second World War.

The 45th anniversary of liberation was 5 May, and many Canadian veterans of the Second World War had made the trip to Holland to take part in the special celebrations. They were greeted with parades, flowers, receptions and chants of "Thank you, Canada." It was a joyful and emotional day for everyone. Canadian flags were flown in every town and city, and signs everywhere repeated the message, "Thank you, Canada."

The Dutch people also remember that Canada provided sanctuary to their royal family during the occupation of their country. Queen Juliana's daughter Margriet was born in Ottawa during those years and the hospital room declared to be Dutch territory for the occasion. Since war ended, the city of Ottawa has received hundreds of thousands of tulip bulbs every year as a gesture of gratitude from the Dutch people.

Let us today remember the dedication of all of those who served in the Canadian forces in Europe. They performed bravely and well, enduring the horrors of war to secure the

freedom that we all now enjoy. We also honour the memory of those who did not return, those who paid the ultimate price for freedom's sake.

We join with the many Ontario citizens of Dutch origin on this happy anniversary and thank them for their contribution to the prosperity of this province.

ANNIVERSARY OF WINERY

Mr Dietsch: Last Thursday, Chateau Gai celebrated 100 years of wine making and officially unveiled its new name and logo, Cartier Wines and Beverages.

The roots of this wine-making company go back as far as 1888 and it has made immeasurable steps within the industry since that time. The winery now employs approximately 500 people and is the second largest supplier of wine to the Liquor Control Board of Ontario.

On 5 July 1989 Ridout Wines, a division of John Labatt Ltd, was acquired by means of a management buyout. Canada's most successful manufacturer and distributor of quality wines and beverages became a privately owned company, creating the country's only employee-owned commercial winery.

Their innovative approach to marketing has led to the success of such products as Canada Cooler, the first light wine, Capistro, as well as juice coolers and carbonated juices. Furthermore, many are beverages with reduced and zero alcohol levels.

At this time, I would like to commend the employees of Cartier for their dedication, as well as the managing partners, Don Triggs, Peter Grainger, Allan Jackson, Rick Thorpe, John Hall and Alan George, for their leadership and commitment to excellence.

Please join with me as I wish Cartier Wines and Beverages another 100 years of successful wine-making in Ontario.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Miss Martel: Last summer the Youth Action program in Sudbury was responsible for creating some 2,500 jobs for students in the city and region; 11 young people promoted the program and encouraged employers and seniors to hire their peers to gain valuable work experience. Everyone attending the closing celebrations agreed the program had been highly successful.

Rumour now has it that the Ministry of Skills Development will be cutting back on its funding to Youth Action. In 1989, the federal ministry of state for youth and Ontario's Ministry of Skills Development each provided \$21,500 to the program, but given the cutbacks in transfer payments announced at the federal level, it appears that share of funding will be reduced. In turn, the provincial government is expected to diminish its contribution to this worthwhile project.

That reduction will be difficult to understand or accept, especially in light of the commitment made by the corporate sector to the program. Last year, Mid-Canada Communications Corp provided free advertising worth \$60,000 to promote Youth Action. The office equipment, including chairs, desks etc, was provided free by Muirhead Stationers. Given the major role the private sector has already played to support the program, it would be unreasonable for this government to reduce its funding.

The Youth Action program allows young people to develop administrative and managerial skills while providing a valuable service to employers, seniors and other young people. It is not a program which should be gutted by this government.

1340

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION FINANCING

Mr Jackson: It appears that the Minister of Colleges and Universities has misplaced \$12.7 million. In the November transfer payment announcements, the minister committed \$12.7 million for the construction of la Cité collégiale, the new French-language community college in Ottawa. However, the Treasurer's budget failed to mention this \$12.7-million allocation. Treasury officials, during the budget lockup, indicated that the ministry had decided to rent a building for the new French-language college and therefore the \$12.7 million would be transferred into the operating funds allocated to Ontario's 23 community colleges.

This seems like a reasonable explanation, but it does not correspond with the information that the Chairman of Management Board released on 2 May. The main series estimates for 1990-91 indicate that the \$12.7 million is back as a capital allocation for the construction of a new college.

It is clear that the ministry and the Treasurer have different ideas about how this \$12.7 million should be spent. If la Cité collégiale is not built in fiscal year 1990-91, the money should revert to operating revenues.

The minister has a responsibility to ensure that precious tax resources allocated to post-secondary education are not clawed back by the Treasurer into his consolidated revenue fund. I suggest that Sean Conway should find his \$12.7 million and tell Ontario taxpayers just exactly how he is going to spend it.

BETTY SMITH

Mr Ballinger: I am pleased to rise in the House today, as the member for the riding of Durham-York, and pay tribute to a constituent of mine from the town of Georgina.

Betty Smith was named a recipient of a 1989 community volunteer award, sponsored by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, on 25 April. Mrs Smith was honoured for her work as a volunteer with York Region Home Support Services, serving as a member of the board as well as a member of the local home support services board. She currently chairs the Meals on Wheels committee for York region, which sets standards for the program across the region. She is also instrumental in planning for expansion to unserved areas.

It was 17 years ago when Mrs Smith founded the first Meals on Wheels unit for York region, serving just four clients. Today this necessary and worthwhile program has expanded to include 400 clients, who receive in excess of 50,000 meals a year. There is no question that without Mrs Smith's dedication and unselfish contribution, many of those clients would not be able to stay in their own homes, which is why the Meals on Wheels program has been so successful under her guidance.

It has been pointed out many times that Betty Smith is one of the town of Georgina's and York region's greatest assets. She is a tremendously dedicated volunteer who certainly has her community's best interests at heart.

I also want to congratulate the ministry for selecting Mrs Smith as one of the 10 winners from across Ontario. She certainly is worthy of the honour being bestowed upon her at this time.

DRUG ABUSE

Mr Hampton: Over the past few weeks, the people of northern Ontario have been treated to some interesting lessons as to how the Minister of Health misspends health care dollars.

Today on the front page of the *Globe and Mail* we have yet another example. OHIP is paying up to \$800 a day for treatment of Ontario drug addicts to attend private clinics in the United States. Documents obtained by the *Globe and Mail* show, for example, that a Buffalo hospital billed OHIP \$24,000 for two treatment visits of 56 days to its clinic. Patients are sent to clinics in New York, Colorado, Louisiana, Minnesota, Washington and Texas. The clinics then bill OHIP for 28 days of treatment.

Taxpayers may wonder why this expensive help has to be purchased at high cost in the United States. It is because the Minister of Health, despite all of her pronouncements about having a planned and rational health care system, has missed the boat again. As a result, the taxpayers of Ontario and the citizens of Ontario who urgently need access to health care have to pay the costs again.

People in northern Ontario, who frequently have to wait months on waiting lists to receive needed health care in southern Ontario and then receive only meagre travel assistance to get there, can be forgiven if they wonder who is looking after the books in the Ministry of Health in this government.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE DISABLED

Mr Jackson: The Liberal government has an extremely poor record with regard to fulfilling the needs of persons with disabilities. Access to public transportation is nothing short of inadequate in this province. The government made a number of promises during the 1987 election to improve access to public transportation but, unfortunately, has not implemented them. I would like to comment on the progress of some of these two-and-a-half-year-old election promises.

The government promised \$2.5 million annually over five years to provide lower transit fees for seniors and the disabled. To date, the government has not spent one cent on the implementation of this program.

To encourage smaller communities to provide special needs transit services, \$14.3 million was committed over five years. Almost three years after the promise was made, no money has been spent towards the implementation of this initiative. The program is apparently still in the developmental stages.

The annual supplement of \$2.5 million designed to improve access to public transit has also not been spent. Last month the Minister of Transportation announced a \$5-billion initiative for public transit in Toronto. It was again disappointing that there was no mention made as to whether or not these new transit systems would be fully accessible to persons with disabilities.

It is disappointing that the election promises made by the David Peterson government in 1987 to improve conventional transit are still in the developmental stages. I would like to take this opportunity to urge the government to take immediate measures to ensure that public transportation is accessible to persons with disabilities in Ontario.

ENVIRONMENT DAY

Mr J. B. Nixon: Yesterday, Sunday 6 May, was Environment Day in the community of York Mills. More than 350 people from the community came out to help clean up Deer Lake Creek, which is a tributary of the East Don River, to plant over 1,000 trees in association with the North York arborist and

view exhibits by such groups as Greenpeace, Pollution Probe, the Federation of Ontario Naturalists and the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

It was a good day for all. We got out several tons of garbage from Deer Lake Creek and, as I say, 1,000 trees—black locusts, maples, white pines and others—were planted. The community, I think, is beginning to become aware that some action on the environment has to begin locally and an international spirit will only develop after local communities have seen the need for action within their community.

In addition, four public schools, Denlow Public School, Owen Public School, Dunlace Public School and Milneford Junior High School, participated through a poster campaign. Over 150 posters were submitted and some were selected as being most representative of the community's aspiration for a cleaner environment. It was a wonderful day for all.

The Speaker: That completes the allotted time for members' statements. I might just say that I noted in a couple of members' statements that members referred to members of the House, not by their riding but by their given name and surname, and that is a tradition we try to stay away from.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Mr R. F. Johnston: On a point of order in relation to section 104 and subsections 106(a) and 106(b) of the standing orders, Mr Speaker: I rise as the critic for the New Democratic Party for Education, Skills Development and Colleges and Universities and as a member of the social development committee of this House, because I have learned just today that the standing committee on resources development is planning on meeting this afternoon and has already decided to deal with the matter of workplace literacy under its mandate this afternoon and has an agenda proposed, which I would like to show you, which you will note was designed for a subcommittee meeting last week which was not held and is now the agenda for this week.

I rise because in section 104 of our standing orders, you will note that we established certain committees with certain titles, one of them being the standing committee on social development, another being the standing committee on resources development, and then we describe what those committees shall be allowed to do. Under 106(a) it says that committees "shall, in addition to any other powers granted to them, be authorized to study and report on all matters relating to the mandate, management, organization or operation of the ministries and offices which are assigned to them from time to time, as well as the agencies, boards and commissions reporting to such ministries and offices." Standing order 106(b) allows the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly to prescribe those ministries from time to time.

Mr Speaker, I would like to raise with you the fact that in the appendices to our standing orders, you will notice the requirements of the standing committee on social development and on resources development and you will see that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Skills Development are all under the purview of the standing committee on social development. Workplace literacy falls under the Ministry of Skills Development, not under any ministry which is under the ambit of the committee on resources development. Some other aspects of literacy fall under other ministries, but they fall under Education and they fall under Colleges and Universities, both of which are under the committee on social development.

1350

I did not know where to go with this concern. Here I am the critic for these matters, and a member of a committee responsible for these matters, and I discover that this afternoon another committee is going to be dealing with these matters, contrary to our standing orders as I read them. The social development committee does not sit today; so I cannot raise this problem with my Chair. Perhaps some communication can be made to the Chairman of the resources development committee and the members of that committee. No official correspondence has come from this committee to our committee since its decisions last month, I understand, to undertake this kind of matter, or to any of the critics involved in this matter.

I want to know what, if we allow this to continue, there is to prevent any committee from dealing with the same matter that any other committee might choose to deal with. Our standing orders are made precisely for the organization of the time of those committees and in a most appropriate manner. I would ask you, sir, to rule under section 106(a), and our appendices that are attached, that this decision of the standing committee on resources development is out of order and that it not be allowed to sit on this matter until you have ruled on it, if you are not willing to take that decision this afternoon.

The Speaker: First of all, I do not want to suggest that the member be cut down the middle so that he can be in two places at once. I find it difficult with the request made by the member because, as has been my custom and knowledge in the past in this Legislature, it has been pretty well left up to the committees to set their own agenda. I also am aware that many of the agendas are set by the House leaders. I am just in a little quandary to make a decision. If the House would allow me, I would like to discuss it further with the member. I hope it can be resolved that way.

Mr R. F. Johnston: On the matter of this committee meeting this afternoon on this matter, though, I would like to know whether or not you think it should meet on this matter when it is clearly outside of its jurisdiction by our standing orders.

Mr Jackson: I would like to support the point raised by the member. Our caucus is in the exact same position, with my time having to be divided between two committees as well. We certainly would support an interim ruling from you that the committee not meet today until you have had time to reflect further on that. We would support that application.

The Speaker: As I stated earlier, I do not really believe, to my knowledge, that it is up to the Speaker to rule on whether a committee does or does not meet. Probably the best solution to this difficulty would be for the member to go immediately to that committee and make the conflict known, and hopefully the committee could make a decision. But I will discuss it further with the member.

Mr Laughren: On that point of order, if I might—

The Speaker: Order.

Mr Wildman: He is the Chairman of the committee.

The Speaker: I was not aware of that. Fine, I would not want to keep the Chair of the committee from making brief remarks on the matter.

Mr Laughren: Mr Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate, but perhaps it would make your job a little easier as well if, as Chair of the committee, I did not proceed with the

meeting this afternoon until we have heard your decision, hopefully in the next day or so.

The Speaker: That is a very helpful suggestion, but I still think it would be up to the committee to make that decision.

Mrs E. J. Smith: On the same point of order, Mr Speaker: I just wanted to point out that this particular item, when it was sent forward by this committee, was sent forward as workplace illiteracy, and I think it was in the nature of workplace illiteracy that it was seen as not inappropriate.

The Speaker: With respect to the operation of the House, I did make my comments, but before I did, I did look around to see whether any other members wanted to speak, so I think there has probably been enough debate on that matter now.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

TREES ONTARIO

Hon Mrs McLeod: Ontario residents are reaffirming, in unprecedented numbers, how much they value trees.

Few other natural resources contribute more to our wellbeing and comfort. Trees consume carbon dioxide and give back oxygen. They shelter and feed wildlife, prevent soil erosion and provide raw materials for a tremendous range of products, from book paper to baseball bats, toothpicks to turpentine.

A growing number of individuals and corporations in Ontario want to plant trees. My ministry has received a tide of requests in recent months. One example is a personal request from Avie Bennett, chairman and president of McClelland and Stewart publishing house. He and his wife, I understand, have been reducing, reusing and recycling around their home for 20 years, and in recent years his company has switched to printing its books on acid-free, recyclable paper.

He told me that he and his company want to do much more: They want to replace the trees that originally produced the 1,500 tonnes of paper McClelland and Stewart use every year. Avie Bennett is just one of the many corporate leaders who want to offer environmental leadership. These companies are sincerely concerned and are doing something about it.

But Mr Bennett and his counterparts are not foresters. To succeed, they will need additional help and expertise. Already groups such as Trees for Today and Tomorrow and Friends of the Earth have expressed an interest in providing this service. But the demand has been overwhelming; more effort is needed.

That is why I am pleased to announce the creation of Trees Ontario. It is a non-profit foundation to help corporations, groups and individuals that want to plant trees. Trees Ontario will also ensure that trees are planted properly and are tended so that they will survive.

This new foundation is a co-operative venture involving the Ontario Forestry Association and the Ministry of Natural Resources. The association will provide forestry expertise and administrative support; the ministry will support Trees Ontario until the foundation attracts corporate funding and can become independent. Guiding the foundation will be a board of trustees made up of people drawn from Ontario's leading conservation agencies.

A number of organizations have been requested to submit names of potential board members. These include the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ontario Forestry Association, the Canadian Daily Newspaper Publishers Association, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the Ontario Forest Industries Association, the Association of Conservation Authorities of Ontario, the Ontario

Lumber Manufacturers Association and the Conservation Council of Ontario.

This is how it will work: Individuals, groups or corporations that want to plant trees will contact Trees Ontario. The foundation will help design a project that will succeed, arrange for a supply of seedlings and enough private, municipal or Crown land suitable for planting. Almost any size project can be accommodated. The foundation will then help to arrange for enough community volunteers to plant the trees and, afterward, arrange for regular inspections and tending.

This year, my ministry has set aside 500,000 trees for planting by Trees Ontario. Within a few years, we expect the foundation should be helping Ontarians plant more than five million trees annually. We expect thousands of people and scores of corporations are going to get involved. Sponsoring a tree is like giving the environment a gift that keeps giving back for 100 years or more.

The efforts of the foundation will be a welcome supplement to the existing reforestation efforts of the Ministry of Natural Resources which last year undertook the largest forest management program in the history of Ontario, a program which will continue this year.

At this time, I would like to introduce Thor Eaton, who has agreed to be honorary chairman of Trees Ontario, and Robert Staley, president of the Ontario Forestry Association.

I would also like to recognize in the gallery the following representatives from organizations or corporations supporting Trees Ontario: Aird Lewis from Trees for Today and Tomorrow; Avie Bennett, chairman and president of McClelland and Stewart publishing; Sara Feldman, director of public relations for Nabisco Brands Ltd; David Lindsay, president of Duracell; Councillor Tony O'Donohue representing the city of Toronto; Kai Millyard from Friends of the Earth, and Joy Neill, president of the Tree Seedlings Growers' Association of Ontario.

1400

RESPONSES

TREES ONTARIO

Mr Wildman: I would like to respond briefly to the statement just made by the Minister of Natural Resources re Trees Ontario. This is a welcome development in relation to the need for environment protection, particularly as we are concerned about global warming. However, I am concerned about a couple of things.

I note that we have Mr Millyard from the Friends of the Earth as one of the proposed directors. I am wondering how this campaign will relate to the campaign already under way involving Friends of the Earth in Canada, an international campaign called Global Releaf, and whether or not this will mean that Trees Ontario might in some way be in competition for corporate sponsorship. It would be unfortunate if the two could not be integrated and related to one another.

I note also that the minister says the ministry will be making 500,000 trees available to Trees Ontario this year. I would hope that in the future the ministry will not in fact be making available seedlings that the ministry has produced itself, or purchased from contractors for its own reforestation program, but rather will be using some of the seedlings that have been dumped by contractors over the last few years because this ministry has not had enough funding to purchase all the seedlings that have been produced by the private nurseries that produce them on behalf of the ministry and the forest management agreement programs.

I also want to ensure that, as the minister indicated, the Trees Ontario program will in fact be a supplement to the ministry's ongoing reforestation program and the efforts of the ministry and the industry under the FMAs. It would be most unfortunate if the Treasurer, in his own inimitable way, decides that since there is additional corporate financing for reforestation of this sort in Ontario, the ministry's request for increasing its reforestation budget next year and in years following would not be necessary to be met by the Treasury of this province.

We have seen in the past when the Ministry of Natural Resources, under the minister's predecessor, made a commitment to have an upgraded and expanded fish habitat and fish restocking program in this province based on a user fee, the licence for fishing in this province, a promise that this would indeed be funded and be in addition to the ongoing program for fish restocking and improvements to fish habitats. In fact, we found subsequently, as some cynics predicted, that that money somehow found its way into the other aspects of the ministry's fish and wildlife program, such as funding the hiring of conservation officers.

I understand that this is a foundation, so the Treasurer and the minister will not be able to get their hands on any of this funding. That is worth while and something that is a useful approach.

However, I want to emphasize again that while we welcome this effort that will add to the greening, I am sure, of many municipal lands across the province, the efforts on crown lands, while welcome, will not in any way replace but rather supplement the efforts of the ministry for reforestation on crown lands in this province.

Mrs Marland: In responding to the statement by the Minister of Natural Resources regarding Trees Ontario, I want to say at the outset that we actually applaud the government's efforts to get corporations involved in environmental initiatives. However, our concern is, what is there to ensure that these corporations that will be involved are undertaking environmental initiatives within their own companies and to ensure the products being promoted are environmentally friendly, like McClelland and Stewart publishing?

We hope that this is not just a ticket for an easy ride for corporate polluters to jump on a green bandwagon. We have actually heard at first hand that apparently one of the first corporations that will be involved will be Duracell, the battery manufacturer. I know the minister mentioned that in her statement of the appointments. We are wondering about Duracell's own battery program. If Duracell is going to give money to Trees Ontario based on the sale of its alkaline batteries, then we really have to question that aspect from the fact that a battery program like this links environmental consciousness with the purchase of a product that in fact creates more waste and could be hazardous if disposed of in a landfill.

Last week, the Minister of the Environment said he would allow the soft drink industry to reduce its use of refillable bottles and create more waste. This week, the government will promote the consumption of a hazardous household product when it should be promoting reduction of such products or safe alternatives and safe disposal methods. Obviously, in this announcement this week they are going to be using tree planting to justify their actions. We have been told that Duracell will only make the donation for the sale of alkaline batteries, not rechargeable batteries. Alkaline batteries contain hazardous materials, including mercury. The incineration or landfilling of waste containing batteries can pollute air and water. The Danish

people have banned mercury oxide batteries to ensure they are not incinerated.

Rechargeable batteries can be recharged as often as 500 times, so we are really questioning that the government is willing to accept only the ordinary batteries. Although more expensive initially, rechargeables can work out to be cheaper in the long run. They can be recharged several times during the normal life of an equivalent alkaline battery. The government's program should be promoting rechargeable batteries to increase consumer use of this safer alternative. In announcing this program, the government has again failed to recognize the reduction and reuse components of the 3Rs program.

The government should not be preying on the public's concern for the environment to help sell products that could have hazardous effects on the environment. When the Minister of the Environment announced he would relax the soft drink container regulation to allow the industry to use more non-refillable containers, he said that the consumers showed a preference for soft drinks in tins. Does this mean the government is willing to relax all environmental regulations when consumers show a preference for something that is not environmentally compatible? Instead of promoting environmentally safe alternatives, as this government should be, and finding solutions to our waste problem, the government is encouraging the production of even more waste.

I think that to announce the availability of 500,000 trees for planting under the Trees Ontario program is great, but it would be really great if it were a total commitment to trees in Ontario without any strings attached. The fact is that this government has the power to promote environmental programs that we can all be proud of and not be tied to the corporate sector, especially that sector which in itself is selling something that is harmful and a great deal of concern to the environment; namely, the alkaline batteries.

1410

ORAL QUESTIONS

ELEVATORS

Mr B. Rae: My question, in the absence of others, is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. He will today be in receipt of a devastating report on the problem of elevators that have been uninspected for several years because of the substantial drop in the number of inspections and in the number of inspectors, at the same time as the number of installations obviously has increased very substantially.

I want to ask the minister why his government would have sat on a report from Price Waterhouse which was published in 1987 and which states very clearly:

"The significant backlog in planned inspections (approximately 7,200) could result in safety problems. Moreover the ministry could be criticized for allowing this situation to develop. If a significant occurrence materializes, the government could be open to criticism if inspections have not been carried out when scheduled."

That shows that back in 1987 the government was aware of the problem. Why did the government sit on the problem for so long when the government knew how serious it has been getting out there?

Hon Mr Sorbara: I am certainly aware of the press conference that was held this morning and the remarks made by Mr Clancy, who, of course, is president of the Ontario Public Service Employees Union.

The thing that disturbs me a little bit is not what Mr Clancy had to say at his press conference, but that the Leader of the Opposition would associate himself with the press conference and with the remarks that were made there. The fact is that rarely in my years in politics have I seen such a misleading document, so much hyperbole in any one document, and I really regret that the Leader of the Opposition has taken the tack that he has.

The fact is and the truth is that elevators in this province are safe. To suggest otherwise, either Mr Clancy suggesting otherwise or the Leader of the Opposition suggesting otherwise, is just clearly irresponsible.

Mr B. Rae: I asked the minister to comment on Price Waterhouse. Is he saying that the Price Waterhouse report is also incorrect in 1987 when it said that the significant backlog in planned inspections could result in safety problems? Is he denying that this is what it said in 1987, or is he simply saying that that is wrong?

Is the minister denying that whereas in 1976-77 there were 22,000 active installations, 10 years later there were some 28,000 installations? That means installations have gone up. Is he denying that total inspections have gone down since that time from 31,000 to 26,000? The minister has to come clean.

The fact of the matter is that the number of installations has gone up; the number of inspections has gone down. The minister does not even have as many inspectors as the ministry says there are supposed to be in his own ministry. Is he denying those facts to be the case?

Hon Mr Sorbara: Once again, I say to the Leader of the Opposition that if he wants to involve himself and participate in these sorts of silly scare tactics, that is entirely up to him. Let me tell him that the system we have in place in 1990 is far better than the system we had in place in 1985 and the system we had in place in 1987.

Very recently the ministry has been allocated some \$5.1 million in funds to create a tracking system so that we have an accurate record of inspections on every single elevator in the province. It is a system, I just might point out, that will allow us, if we find a problem in inspecting one elevator, to know every other elevator in the province that might potentially develop that problem.

I want to reiterate to my friend the Leader of the Opposition, his fellow New Democratic Party members and anyone who is listening to this question period that they ought not to pay any heed to the silliness of Mr Clancy this morning.

Mr B. Rae: I mentioned Price Waterhouse. I had also mentioned the assistant deputy minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. As he said in a letter dated 4 May 1990, writing to Terry Baxter: "We continue to have recruitment difficulties in the elevating devices branch. This has a direct effect on the workload of operational staff." That is from the minister's own assistant deputy minister. I assume that he is not silly.

The coroner's jury which dealt with the tragic accident of Mr Shale in the Lord Elgin Hotel, which the minister will be familiar with, described this horrendous accident in which Mr Shale, who was a visitor to Canada, was partially decapitated and killed because an elevator was misoperating. They stated that evidence was heard that "the elevator had been giving problems since it was handed over to the hotel on May 16 following renovations....No inspection had been carried out by the ministry."

Those are not the words of whoever it is the minister wants to attack; those are the words of a coroner's jury. The others are

the words of his own assistant deputy minister. The minister has a shortage of inspectors and fewer inspections going on today than were going on before. He cannot deny those facts. What is he going to do about it?

Hon Mr Sorbara: The first thing I would like to do is refer the Leader of the Opposition to the coroner's report following the death at the Lord Elgin Hotel. If he took the time to read it, he would find in the report that the question of inspections and the lack of inspections in the course of the work that was done on that elevator did not contribute at all to the death in that case.

Let's talk for a second about the number of inspections and what is contained in the report. For example, Mr Clancy says in his report that there are not enough inspections done at Commerce Court right here in the city of Toronto. What he fails to mention is that there are three full-time elevator contractors at that very facility who spend all of their working days making sure that every one of the elevators in that facility is safe and working at all times.

To suggest anything else, and I really regret the fact the Leader of the Opposition is doing this, I think is doing a terrible disservice to the people of this province.

AGRICULTURAL LAND

Mr B. Rae: My new question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The minister will know that through the genius of the law it is possible for the owner of land, through a will, to bequeath several lots on the land. In other words, it is possible for a will, or a testamentary devise as it is called, to be used to subvert the protection of agricultural land.

We now have very substantial evidence from the Niagara Peninsula that in fact this practice of using wills to get around the protection of agricultural land has become a very substantial problem, so substantial that the minister, as I am sure he will be aware, has received much correspondence from the regional council in Niagara and indeed suggestions that this particular loophole be closed.

I want to ask the minister what he is going to do to close the loophole under which valuable farm land is being lost today in the Niagara Peninsula. Many more acres will be lost unless the loophole is closed.

Hon Mr Sweeney: I want to thank the honourable member for raising this issue because I share his concern with it. As soon as it was brought to my attention I immediately asked my staff for a history of how we got to this particular point.

I was advised that back in 1983, when the Planning Act was being rewritten, the possibility of this type of event occurring was drawn to the attention of the government. They did a legal investigation and were advised there was obviously a clear conflict between the legislation dealing with the sanctity of wills and that dealing with the Planning Act of the province of Ontario. A decision was made not to change the act at that time.

Subsequent to that, and over the last four or five years, I guess it has been now, the staff at the ministry have been watching to see whether or not anyone has been taking advantage of this particular situation, and the evidence simply has not been there.

However, the honourable member has drawn attention to a specific set of concerns in the Niagara Peninsula. I have, as a matter of fact, just this morning been in touch with Mr Dick, the regional chairman. I indicated to him that we share his concern and that we are once again doing a legal analysis of what can be

changed in the legislation to prevent the misuse of this particular operation.

Mr B. Rae: This is taking place right under the minister's nose. He should understand. For example, we know in one case that has now been documented very particularly, a widow sells the land to a developer for \$200,000, let's say. The developer sells it back to the widow for \$1. The lots are then devised in such a way that some of the lots are bequeathed to her family, but the vast majority of the lots are bequeathed to the developer and other individuals. This all takes place a week before the widow dies.

There is something very wrong with the law if we see the Planning Act and the whole principle of protecting agricultural land being subverted in this way. At this point, this is all entirely legal. The minister has had correspondence on this. He has had the evidence put in front of him as to what is going on. Is the minister going to close this loophole, yes or no?

1420

Hon Mr Sweeney: I am aware of the particular incident that the leader has described and, as I drew to his attention, our experience over the last number of years is in fact that where this procedure has been used, it has been used in a legitimate fashion.

I think we have had something like about 10 examples over the last few years, and in each case it has been a legitimate demise in the family, a legitimate will, and the number of lots being created was in the neighbourhood of five, six or seven, usually for children of the deceased person. As long as that was occurring, as the honourable member said, it is certainly legal. As long as it was occurring in that way, the decision of the government was not to make any changes.

However, the particular type of procedure he described has been brought to our attention, and that is why I told Mr Dick this morning that we, for the last number of weeks, have been looking at the legal ramifications of changing the law of wills in this province. However, I think the honourable member, with his own legal background, would know the difficulties in that area and how careful one must be not in any way to prohibit a person from making a legitimate will that would carry out his or her particular wishes.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon Mr Sweeney: That is where we are having the difficulty. We want to be sure that in solving the problem, we do not create another one.

The Speaker: Order. Final supplementary.

Mr B. Rae: I want to ask the minister if he will look at the report which has been made available. I am sure he has seen it. The report, dated 25 April 1990, and adopted by the regional council of Niagara on 3 May 1990, refers to a number of examples: a parcel of land of 11.5 acres; a parcel of land of approximately 54 acres; another one of 25 acres; another one of 225 acres; several other potential lots in the city of Niagara Falls, the town of Pelham, the city of St Catharines, Fort Erie.

This problem is obviously widespread, and it is increasingly going to be a problem because of the crisis in agriculture which the minister is familiar with, and in particular because of the crisis in the tender fruit market and the grape market. The minister knows the pressures that are on farmers in this area, the tremendous pressures that are on development, and he knows the activities of developers in this area. What he is going to do,

not after the horse has long bolted but before the problem becomes an epidemic? What is he going to do about it?

Hon Mr Sweeney: The honourable leader has asked basically the same question three times. For the third time, the honourable member should let me share once again the fact that a legal analysis, a legal review and a series of legal interpretations are being brought to my attention as the minister.

When I am assured that we can resolve this particular loophole without in any way detracting from the sanctity of people to make legitimate wills, then I am prepared to make a change. But I am not prepared to make the change to close this particular loophole, as concerned as I am with it—and the leader's question is certainly a legitimate question to raise—if I am going to create another problem another way.

In other words, I am prepared to make the change, I am prepared to resolve the difficulty, but I want to do it in a legally appropriate way. I think the honourable leader would appreciate that.

DRUG ABUSE

Mr Brandt: My question is for the Minister of Health. I was shocked to learn of the trail of human misery that is occurring between Ontario and the United States with respect to the number of drug addicts who must go to a foreign jurisdiction in order to receive treatment as a result of the limited number of facilities that are available in Ontario. These particular numbers, according to press reports, are reaching alarming proportions.

Is the minister aware of the problem with respect to the number of people who find it necessary to go to the United States for treatment for drug addiction? And what does the minister intend to do about it?

Hon Mrs Caplan: First, as a clarification on policy for the leader of the third party, Ontario health insurance coverage for out-of-country treatment for alcohol and drug addiction is provided to Ontario residents in the same manner as assistance is provided for any illness. I am pleased to tell the member opposite that funding during the last three years for alcohol and drug addiction programs has increased by some 126%, from \$19.1 million to \$43.3 million this past year.

Mr Brandt: That was a very interesting answer to a question that I did not ask. The question I asked is, what is the minister doing about the increased numbers of individuals with addiction problems who find it necessary to go to the United States?

The minister indicates that there has been an increase in funding. Let me indicate to the minister the increase in the severity of the problem. In 1984-85 there were 654 Ontario residents who received treatment paid for by OHIP in the United States. In 1987-88 that number had just about doubled. That was over the course of about three years.

Since it is not a cost-saving matter that we are talking about, having these patients treated in the United States, it could well be less expensive to have them treated here in Ontario if facilities were available. The minister is paying anyway. Why is she allowing this problem to continue, namely, Ontario residents going to the United States to receive treatment that is paid for by OHIP when it should be provided here in Ontario?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I find it passing strange that the leader of the third party, whose party did virtually nothing in the way of providing appropriate programming when it had the opportunity, would really stand in this House and ask this question. I

already told him the tremendous strides that we are making in improving not only treatment but also prevention opportunities. This government has taken an overall strategic approach by developing an anti-drug strategy.

As part of that strategy I want to tell the member as well that we have a treatment advisory committee made up of 12 members from across the province. This was announced by my colleague the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy, who is heading up this very important program. This treatment advisory committee will examine existing methods of treatment for drug abusers, look at treatment programs and recommend future treatment approaches.

I want to say to the member opposite that while there is always room for improvement in the programs here in Ontario, during the same period of time over the last three years alone, the number of programs have increased from 93 to 150 here in Ontario.

Mr Brandt: The minister should be aware that drug users entering the United States are doing so illegally, as a result of US law. She is well aware of that. She is also well aware of the fact that many who are close to the drug scene in a professional capacity, as counsellors and those working in treatment centres, have indicated that the drug problem in this province may well be reaching epidemic proportions as a result of the increased numbers.

The amount of money that the ministry is contributing towards this problem admittedly has increased. The amount of money, however, that she is spending in a foreign jurisdiction, namely, to the south of us, is going up by leaps and bounds as a result of people who are being forced as a result of lack of facilities in Ontario to go to the United States.

The minister is paying the bills anyway. Why does she not pay the bills for the residents of this province for treatment in this province rather than forcing them to go to another jurisdiction to get that treatment?

Hon Mrs Caplan: As the member opposite knows full well, I think, people in Ontario choose for a variety of reasons to access services in alternative locations. I want to point out to him that as recently as last March, just a few weeks ago, my colleague announced a substantive and important enhancement of treatment resources here in Ontario. For example, through the Ministry of Health some \$2 million in capital funding is being made available to the Donwood Institute. As well, \$1.6 million specifically targeted for youth drug treatment programs was announced by my colleague. We are making progress in addressing a program need that was left unattended by the former government for quite some time. I am proud of the progress that we are making here in Ontario and I am sure he is too.

1430

TORONTO WATERFRONT

Mr Cousens: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Last Monday the minister announced with great fanfare the provincial government's proposal for the future of Harbourfront. He also stated in his announcement that Darcy McKeough has been appointed by the federal government to implement the provincial report. He talks in his press conference about representing the federal government in the implementation of the provincial government report.

Oddly enough, Mr McKeough's mandate is to study all the reports that have been tabled. In the federal press release, it is not a foregone conclusion that the provincial ideas will auto-

matically be adopted. I have the press release here in which Elmer MacKay, federal Minister of Public Works, says, "After an in-depth analysis of these very complex proposals, we still retain some elements of concern and we would like to meet with provincial representatives to see how these concerns can be addressed."

Why would the minister lead us to believe that the Ontario government report would form the basis of an agreement on Harbourfront?

Hon Mr Sweeney: Primarily because we had agreed with the federal government when we started that there were three goals we were aiming for. The first one was to remove the condominium buildings off the waterfront. The federal government agrees with that. We indicated how it could be done. The second one was to protect the financial and land interests of the city of Toronto. They wanted that to happen. We showed them how it could be done. The third one was their agreement with the Crombie report—the honourable member might remember back in August, I think, of last year—which strongly recommended that Harbourfront itself should no longer be a development entity but only a programming entity.

All three of those goals were contained within the report we gave to the federal government. They had indicated to us in our meetings with them that they supported the achievement of those three goals. They said right from the very beginning—as I said from the very beginning—that the detailed application of reaching that may change. That is their option. They own the land; we do not. We were an honest broker between them and the other partners.

Mr Cousens: It is less than an implementation then of the minister's report and proposals. There is still a great deal of negotiation and working out with different levels of government, because we have the federal government, the city of Toronto and the province all involved in this, and it is not in any way resolved as to how it will be finally settled.

There is a question that comes out in the report. On page 63, it outlines the terms on which the developers Huang and Danczkay, the Hawley group and Ramparts will relinquish their waterfront sites south of Queen's Quay. Under each proposal, the developers receive various parcels of land under special terms and they will cease to pay leasing fees to Harbourfront in exchange for their original sites.

Is the minister in support of the deal that gives these developers public land for free and exempts them from paying leasing fees to Harbourfront, some \$86 million that is used to sustain Harbourfront's cultural activities? Is he in favour of that kind of relinquishing?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I would remind my honourable friend that when I, as the minister, announced a zoning order placed on those lands for the purposes I described to him in my first answer, the response from all quarters—the city, the federal government, Harbourfront and some in the public—was that it cannot be done, that it was impossible, that the deal was set, that no changes could be made and that you just had to accept that fact.

The second response was that if you could make a change, it would cost \$100 million of money from some level of government in order to accomplish that. The fact remains that it was done despite the fact that everybody said it could not be. The fact remains that there is not one additional extra cent from any level of government in order to complete it.

Mr Cousens: Maybe the minister then, to clarify some of the concerns I have, could table with the House and with myself

copies of the agreements with each of those developers so that we could see what he traded off for. I would be very interested if that could be made available to us.

The minister in his announcement also said there was an endowment of \$50 million that will yield some \$5 million a year for the ongoing cultural activities at Harbourfront. Yet when you start seeing the kind of money it takes to provide excellent cultural activities, the moneys that he is going to make available to them now are even less than what the Art Gallery of Ontario gets. They would have an endowment of \$160 million in order to provide what they need. The Ontario Science Centre would require an endowment of \$246 million, Ontario Place of \$94 million and the Royal Ontario Museum of \$380 million; so the kinds of dollars the minister is talking about really do not begin to do that much.

How can the minister be satisfied with a provincial proposal that not only strips Harbourfront of its ability to generate revenue but threatens the cultural activities it was designed to provide?

Hon Mr Sweeney: Going back to my colleague's editorial comment, if I can use it that way, he will see from the description in the report that the buildings that were on the water's edge are simply moving back, north of Queen's Quay, and occupying another site that had already been identified for a building, so it was just a site-for-site exchange.

With respect to the funding, at the present time Harbourfront is spending for its programming purposes—let's make it very clear that they have two very distinct functions and two budgets, their programming function and their development function. For their programming purposes they are spending somewhere in the neighbourhood of about \$13 million. A \$50-million endowment would produce at 12%, not 10%—I mean, you can go out into the market and get 12% or more, given today's rates—somewhere between \$6 million and \$7 million a year.

The member should keep in mind also that part of Harbourfront's current revenue is the fees it receives from the rental of its programming buildings—not the development buildings, the programming buildings—and ticket sales and things like that. That comes to in the neighbourhood of \$5 million or \$6 million a year. So we are talking of the combination of the fees and the endowment producing the same money they are getting now to carry out today's programs. I would also remind him that—

The Speaker: Thank you. Order.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Kormos: I have a question for the Minister of Financial Institutions. This government tells us that it is going to spend almost \$10 million in the first year of its automobile insurance commission's new life. That is after this government has given the insurance industry everything it has asked for. Indeed, beyond that, it has given the insurance industry in Ontario more than it dared ask for. It is after this government refuses to incorporate one—not one—of the many recommendations made to it by critics of this bad legislation. Another \$10 million: How can that be justified when all this is is just window dressing for what is a \$1-billion giveaway, to the industry, that is contained in Bill 68?

Hon Mr Elston: I am glad the honourable member has asked me a question. Finally I can get the floor to straighten him out and provide some factual material for the people of the province.

First of all, let me tell the honourable gentleman that because of the requirement for the new insurance commission to act on behalf of the consumers, there is a need to upgrade the people who are going to be dealing directly, on behalf of the consumers, with the insurance industry. There is also a need to increase the number of staff who will be dealing with the alternative dispute resolution portion of the bill, and as a result there will be people doing mediation and arbitration on behalf of the consumers when they have a dispute with the insurance industry.

This particular legislation is designed to give reasonable cost to the people who must have insurance—that is everybody who drives in Ontario—and good benefit levels to protect the people against being left high and dry, as it were, as often occurs under the current levels of no-fault and under the current tort law. This legislation is a balanced approach to cost-effective provision of services of insurance coverage for the people of the province, unlike the impression the honourable gentleman would try to leave for the people of the province.

Mr Kormos: I will tell members this: With this Bill 68 from the Liberals, this government is rolling over for the auto insurance industry here in Ontario. This auto insurance legislation and its companion commission are going to deny 95% of all innocent injured victims the right to be compensated. It is going to result in a net decrease in benefits. It is going to result in insurance premiums for drivers in this province going up by as much as 50% and, we know for a third of a million, by as much as 80%.

This government would not enforce the legislation that put so-called freezes or caps on premiums. This government would not control the industry when it engaged in premium flips and premium shuffles. This government would not control the industry when it arbitrarily denied people auto insurance coverage. This government refuses to debate the very bill that it says it is prepared to talk about. Why carry on the charade of doing anything other than simply giving the auto insurance industry what it wants, everything that it wants?

1440

Hon Mr Elston: The honourable gentleman says that we refuse to debate, after over a month of his yammering on and precluding any other member, preventing anybody in this House from standing and addressing the issues, which he has put in his own socialist fashion so that he can frustrate the introduction of a reasonable plan to provide benefits to the people who are driving in this province. He cannot stand and say that we will not debate the bill. He has prevented the democratic institution of this Legislature from going forward to examine the real provisions of this act, which are to provide a benefit that is balanced against price so that people can in fact afford to have insurance coverage in the province.

Mr Kormos: You won't debate.

Hon Mr Elston: No-fault benefits have been increased hugely, so that we can provide the basic support that is required for people when they get into accidents. We have gone now so that people in the basic coverage will have \$600 per week of tax-free coverage, if in fact they earn the gross salary that takes them to that level. If they require more, there is the option to purchase it.

Mr Kormos: You sold out the drivers. You sold out the taxpayers. You sold out—

Hon Mr Elston: But even now that member for Welland-Thorold is barracking away, after days and weeks and hours of continuous yammering, which precluded even the members of the third party, who I would compare as being almost reasonable when measured against his perpetual and continual blabbering, from taking part so that we could get on with this. I hope the debate can move forward and we can—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I hope many of the members will allow the member for Simcoe East to ask a question.

ORILLIA SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr McLean: My question is for the Minister of Health and it concerns the redevelopment of Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital. Almost three years ago—as a matter of fact, the day before the election was called—the former minister committed \$30 million to the Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital. Since that time the community has raised some \$5.8 million to help that project, which was valued at about \$45 million. Is that \$30 million still there for the hospital and when can it start the project?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I am pleased to tell the member in the House, as I have told every community across this province, that the total capital dollars committed to any region stand for the purpose of providing appropriate capital facilities within the overall capital framework that has been announced. I want him to know that the County of Simcoe District Health Council, along with all of the partners, the hospitals, will begin a review to look at how those capital resources can best be used to meet the needs of the people on a regional basis. I understand those discussions are beginning.

Mr McLean: I want to thank the minister for her commitment of that \$30 million, and I am sure it will be forthcoming when the necessary plans are completed. Since the minister has committed that \$30 million now, when will it be able to start with the new addition?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I want to be very, very clear to the member opposite and to all members of this House. We know review is under way to ensure that the service needs of Orillia are considered in the context of regional planning for Simcoe county. I want him to know that the district health council is very involved in this process, and as well I am aware that the ministry considers the development of the Royal Victoria Hospital in Barrie as a priority for the region.

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING SERVICE

Mr Tatham: My question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Several weeks ago the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food announced that the number of staff in the agricultural engineering service of the ministry was being reduced. Could the minister tell us how farmers can obtain information about building plans and other engineering projects?

Hon Mr Ramsay: In answer to my friend across the way, I would like to say that tomorrow we will be announcing the final establishment of the 12 new engineering specialist positions throughout the province. It is interesting to note that when we examined this service, we found that the majority of the requests to our engineers by farmers or other clients was for basically off-the-shelf plans, technical fact sheets and other technical information. From there, we found that our farm

clients basically used that information themselves or hired contractors to carry out the work. We feel that service is in place and that really only 27% of the time of our ag engineers was used in direct contact with our farm clients.

Mr Tatham: Could the minister tell us where the specialists are located and what their duties will be?

Hon Mr Ramsay: I could look up a list here for the honourable member. It just so happens there is one in Woodstock, and I am sure the member is pleased with that. Others are located in Stratford, Alfred, Wayford, Vineland Station, Clinton, London, St Thomas, Waterloo, Fergus, Nepean, Brighton and Newmarket. As I said before to the member, I will be announcing who the specialists are and what their specialty is with regard to these locations. I feel that we have a service here that will serve Ontario farmers well.

POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr D. S. Cooke: In the absence of the Minister of the Environment, I have a question for the Premier. The Premier will be aware that there are a large number of environmental problems on the border between Detroit and Windsor. Last week, decisions were made by the Michigan authorities that while the Detroit incinerator, the world's largest incinerator, did not meet proper standards and was emitting all sorts of chemicals that were not satisfactory, it was going to be given seven years to bring that brand-new incinerator up to standard.

Does the Premier agree with me that it is time the Ontario government, led by himself, had a summit with the Governor of Michigan on boundary environmental problems so that we can solve some of these major problems that are impinging on the Windsor area?

Hon Mr Peterson: I am obviously very happy to do anything we can do that is constructive in these discussions. As the member knows, we have worked together with Michigan on a number of problems we have had. I remember the great Dow blob of a couple of years ago and that kind of thing.

As the member knows, there has been a very serious difference of opinion over this incinerator. Ontario has been in court on this particular matter. The Ministry of the Environment has been extremely aggressive about it. Certainly I do not preclude doing anything that can be constructive in the circumstances, but my honourable friend knows that at the end of the day we do not have the power or the jurisdiction on this side of the border. That does not mean we will not pursue this as vigorously as we can in the courts.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I think that at the political level the Premier could establish a direct meeting with the Governor of Michigan only on environmental issues. Perhaps the Governor of Michigan would want to talk about our problems down Sarnia way and some of the things the Ontario government could do to clean up its act as well.

Specifically, today a barge operation is beginning in Windsor that will be crossing from Windsor to Detroit carrying dangerous goods. The Minister of the Environment here in Ontario has been saying for several weeks that he is going to establish an environmental assessment if the federal government does not. The federal government made its decision last Friday that it was not going to carry out an environmental assessment. This government still has not decided. Is it or is it not going to approve an environmental assessment and stop this barge while that environmental assessment is carried out by the provincial government?

Hon Mr Peterson: I have not had an opportunity to speak with the Minister of the Environment today on that subject but, as the member knows, we have a very vigorous and active Minister of the Environment and I am sure he will carry through on everything he says.

CAPITAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Minister of Education. On Friday, the minister announced capital allocations for new schools in Ontario. As I read through the literature, I find that the words "renovations and repairs" are noticeable by their absence. Could the minister please share with the House the percentage of moneys that will be allocated for repair and renovation of older or declining school buildings in Ontario for this year?

Hon Mr Conway: I am pleased to have the interest of my friend the member for Burlington South in the just-announced capital allocations for Ontario schools. I can tell him that we are very sensitive to all of the pressures in the school community, not just renovations and repairs but the pressures for replacement facilities, and of course the pressure for new schools in the growth areas.

The allocation announced on Friday brings to \$1.5 billion the provincial grant in support of Ontario schools. The announcement on Friday will concern itself with some 100-plus schools: something in the neighbourhood of 49 new or replacement schools and some 57 additions.

We recognize that there is more to be done, but I can assure my honourable friend that this \$300 million, which will cause some \$544 million worth of school construction, will go a very considerable distance to meeting many of the pressures in the community.

1450

Mr Jackson: My question was about renovation and repairs. The Ontario Public School Boards' Association has referred to the declining state of school buildings in this province as a major crisis. The minister would be aware that 1,000 of the 4,600 elementary and secondary schools in our province are over 50 years of age. This is a serious problem that requires our attention.

Taxpayers this year will pay for over \$200 million worth of projects that they get no provincial support for. School boards are having to put up every penny of this directly from taxpayers and the property tax base. So it has become an expensive crisis for taxpayers in Ontario and this government will not even give us the limited percentage of money that is being allocated. There is no more money in this year's budget. We know from the Treasurer he extended the cap on capital allocations three years.

When will this government respond to the all-party select committee on education report which specifically recommends that this crisis be addressed by the minister's government with a special fund for renovation and repair of these declining buildings? When will the minister respond?

Hon Mr Conway: This government under this Treasurer has, I repeat, announced the fifth year of a \$1.5-billion program—a \$300-million annual provincial grant. I repeat, \$300 million a year of provincial grant for five years; that is \$1.5 billion. Let me repeat that in the most recent announcement there will be several projects for replacement of old schools—I know I have some in my own community—and there are going

to be a number of others that are additions to old schools, to say nothing of all the growth pressures.

I want to conclude by saying that in the announcements I made on Friday the Halton region, the honourable member's home region, will get something like \$40.7 million worth of allocation, and that \$40.7 million is more than 50% of what the Tories were offering the whole province five years ago.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION FINANCING

Mr M. C. Ray: My question is for the Minister of Education. In view of that last response, let me say there is gratitude in the city of Windsor for a new Dougall Avenue public school and a renovation of \$4.5 million to the new Catholic Central high school.

The minister will know that the Report of the Premier's Council: Competing in the New Global Economy stated that there would be an in-depth review of the educational issues arising from the recommendations in that report and that there would be strategic policy approaches forthcoming.

I understand that the report has been written, that it has been presented to the government but that it has not yet been published. Could the Minister of Education advise why the report has not yet been published, when it will be released and whether the current budget anticipates the recommendations in the report?

The Speaker: Thank you. That sounds like three questions.

Hon Mr Conway: Let me just say at the outset, I very much appreciate the work done by my friend the member for Windsor-Walkerville and others from the government caucus in response to the capital requests of various school boards. I want simply to indicate that the Premier's Council has been busily at work on the very important aspect of human resource development for the Ontario economy into the 1990s and beyond.

The honourable member is not quite right, though. The report is not completed; the members of the council are hard at work trying to conclude that very important report.

Mr B. Rae: Strangling each other.

Hon Mr Conway: I can assure my friend the Leader of the Opposition that all of the members of the council are very committed and very constructive in their efforts to conclude this work and to produce the report at the earliest opportunity.

Mr M. C. Ray: The fact that the report is not yet written or completed may explain why, in his capacity as guest editorial writer for the Windsor Star last week, the minister expressed views on educational reform required in our system to meet the challenges of the global economy, but I must say there was scant reference to university initiatives and university funding. The minister will know that on a comparative basis our universities have not been as well financed as our primary and secondary schools in recent years, nor on a comparative basis have they been as well financed as universities in other provinces have been financed.

Could the minister please advise whether universities are to be viewed as engines for economic growth and development, and when this government is going to make a true financial commitment to our universities?

Hon Mr Conway: I think my friend the member for Windsor-Walkerville and I would have a slightly different point of view on the performance of this government in response to the university question.

Mr Pelissero: That's the no-down-payment party, the socialists.

Hon Mr Conway: I understand that the no-down-payment party would of course promise everything and deliver much less.

I want to say to my friend the member for Windsor-Walkerville that over the course of the past five years since we took office, operating grants to Ontario universities have risen by over 50%. We have tripled the capital support for Ontario universities, some of which has found its way to the very fine University of Windsor. I spent some very productive hours a few weeks ago with the president of that illustrious institution, looking at the improvements that have been made and others that are contemplated.

In the budget read by my colleague the Treasurer a few days ago additional millions of dollars were specifically targeted at a number of areas that the universities have called for special assistance in, and that was offered. The university research incentive funding has been much applauded. The Ontario student assistance program has been very substantially enriched, and for that my colleagues the member for Fort William and the member for York Centre deserve the lion's share of credit.

I think the record of this government, in so far as the universities are concerned, while not perfect is certainly quite good. I am quite prepared to stand by what we have done and compare it quite favourably with anything across the country.

COURT FACILITIES

Mr Kormos: I have a question of the Attorney General. The Welland county courthouse is an imposing and historically significant structure in downtown Welland. As a result of Bill 187 charging the local police with the responsibility for court security, this courthouse, along with the Niagara Falls satellite courthouse, has come under the scrutiny of the Ministry of Labour's occupational health and safety division. The county courthouse in Welland is vital to the administration of justice in Niagara South.

Is the minister aware of the order that has been issued, and what will the minister do to assist the city of Welland in its efforts to comply with that order?

Hon Mr Scott: The honourable member will know that the Welland courthouse, a truly historic building no doubt, is owned by the city of Welland; it is leased by the Ministry of Government Services to provide courtroom facilities. The Ministry of Labour has been in and has determined that the standards maintained there by the city of Welland are inappropriate. I gather a period of time has been given during which the city will have to undertake renovations to meet the standards the ministry has set. I am certain the Minister of Government Services and I will do everything we can to make sure that the city of Welland has that opportunity.

Mr Kormos: The city of Welland feels, rightly or wrongly, that there has been less than effective communication with the province around the matter of court facilities in the judicial district of Niagara South and the Welland county courthouse in particular. The city is anxious to provide safe courthouse facilities. Will the minister agree to meet with city representatives so that matters of mutual interest can be discussed?

Hon Mr Scott: I have no objection to meeting with anybody, of course, and have met with city of Welland officials on a number of occasions. They will want to understand that they have certain obligations under the lease; namely, to make

certain that the space they are renting, for which they are being paid very substantial sums, complies with the standards the law requires. They have the obligation of any other landlord in that respect.

As I have said, the Minister of Government Services and I are very anxious to see the city of Welland comply with the terms of the lease so that the building can be safely and properly occupied by those who want to make use of it. But we expect the city of Welland to undertake its obligations in this respect.

1500

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MINISTRIES

Mr Cureatz: I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I noticed in the first part of April the honourable member for Durham West had made a joint press release with the minister concerning employment equity program funding for the town of Pickering; the member for Durham-York made a joint press release with the minister concerning grants to the townships of Uxbridge and Brock for housing studies; the member for Durham Centre made a joint announcement with the minister concerning a provincial grant for the town of Whitby.

Does the minister and his ministry make a point of contacting all members when he is proposing and when he is distributing these various kinds of news releases?

Hon Mr Sweeney: As my honourable friend would well be aware, the Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs has quite a significant number of announcements to make. It is, quite frankly, not possible to make them all personally. Therefore, as a regular practice I do contact my colleagues and indicate to them whether or not they would be prepared to make the announcement in my place.

Mr Cureatz: That is very kind of the minister. I would like to point out to him that, interestingly enough, the member for Durham West was pleased to announce that the township of Scugog would be receiving funding pertaining to housing studies. The township of Scugog is in the riding of Durham East, of which I am the member. The minister himself had the opportunity of making a particular announcement concerning the town of Newcastle being allocated funds for a municipal housing statement. In other words, he and other various members of our chamber here have had the opportunity of making announcements concerning my riding of Durham East. Would he be so kind in the future, would he need some help with regards to making such future announcements?

Hon Mr Sweeney: My honourable friend has in the past been a member of the government party. He is well aware of the fact that there is a long-standing tradition in the House, going back well over 40 years, that members of the government party help to make announcements on behalf of the government. I am not aware of the fact that members of the opposition normally make announcements on behalf of the government. Personally, I do not intend to change the tradition.

NURSES' PARTICIPATION IN HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT

Mr Neumann: This week is Nurses' Week in Ontario. In keeping with the recognition of that week, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health.

On Friday I met with two representatives of the Ontario Nurses' Association, Sally Cameron and Roberta Sero. We discussed a number of issues related to nursing in the province.

The one question I would like to put to the minister is with respect to the implementation of regulation 518, which requires hospitals to pass bylaws to include nursing representatives on fiscal advisory and other committees.

I asked the minister this about a year ago. I wonder if she could give the House an update on how she is progressing in getting the hospitals to move in this direction.

Hon Mrs Caplan: I want to thank the member for Brantford for the question. I know of his support for my initiative to give nurses more say in hospital decision-making. I am pleased to tell him that many hospitals have submitted bylaws for approval by the ministry and that many others have begun to implement the spirit of the regulation. I can tell him that the ministry is currently reviewing the bylaws which have been submitted. I would encourage hospitals to begin to implement both the fiscal advisory committee and other committees to involve nurses as expeditiously as possible. I am hopeful that all hospitals will comply with the spirit of this new regulation by 30 June 1990.

Mr Neumann: My supplementary relates to the minister's last comment. I am wondering if she has a strategy in place for dealing with hospitals which have not complied with this regulation by 30 June. I believe the nurses across Ontario appreciate the direction the minister has taken with respect to regulation 518. We are wondering how she would deal with hospitals that have not met the regulation by that date.

Hon Mrs Caplan: Thank you very much to the member for Brantford and to others who, I know, have an interest in this matter. The ministry provided to hospitals a model bylaw. Many of them are holding their annual meetings and I am hopeful that we will receive all of those suggested bylaw changes as soon as possible.

We have also informed the hospitals that only those hospitals which are complying with the regulation will be eligible for the nursing innovation fund. I am pleased to tell the member that as of 30 June 1990 only those hospitals that have submitted bylaws to the ministry and have begun implementation of the regulation will be eligible to apply for the hospital incentive fund which is part of the hospital transitional funding.

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES

Mr Wildman: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources regarding the review of the conservation authorities program. It is four years since the Association of Conservation Authorities of Ontario submitted a brief stating that there was need for changes in the funding and mandate of conservation authorities in the province. We still have no substantive changes in funding for conservation authorities, with the result that many of the conservation authorities' programs are in limbo because of the increased cost due to inflation and additional mandates passed on by the province.

Since the conservation authorities are having to cut costs, can the minister indicate when decisions will be made, and can she assure us that resource management programs dealt with previously by conservation authorities, if they are transferred to other responsible agencies, will be carried out in the context of overall watershed planning overseen by conservation authorities?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I know that the honourable member is well aware of the history of the review of the conservation authorities and the fact that when we sent the original report, which is known as the Berger report, out for consultation there

were a number of concerns raised about the report. That was followed up with a further process of consultation through a committee that was headed up by the parliamentary assistant to the previous Minister of Natural Resources.

I subsequently had considerable communication with conservation authorities across the province. There is some measure of agreement about the core mandate for the authorities, as it would be defined, and I think that would provide the honourable member with the assurance that the essential aspects of the operation of the conservation authorities would be protected in any future definition of the role.

But I would indicate that there have also been some concerns raised by some of the conservation authorities about specific issues of amalgamation and there have also been some concerns raised about the funding proposals and how those would impact on the authorities. I would note that some of those concerns have, in particular, been raised by northern authorities. I felt it was necessary, in light of those concerns, to suspend implementation of the review until we had continued to have a very thorough analysis of the impact of the proposed changes on each authority in the province, and that is what we are carrying out now.

Mr Wildman: I recognize the concerns that have been mentioned by the minister, but I want to deal specifically with the core and non-core responsibilities as set out in the minister's report.

Can the minister indicate what agencies, if not conservation authorities, will be responsible for controlling or dealing with concerns related to non-point pollution, water-taking permits, urban and rural drainage design and management of natural areas? If these are non-core activities, how will they be carried out and what relations will the agencies responsible for these non-core programs have to the conservation authority?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I would certainly welcome an opportunity outside the House, if the honourable member wishes, to review each of the proposals in terms of the core responsibilities of the conservation authority and what would, in the recommendations that are in the report, be defined as non-core activities. But certainly the core activities in each of the areas in terms of watershed management, soil erosion, flood control and the management of natural areas, including regional parks, would continue to be within the core mandate of the conservation authorities.

There might be certain other areas in which municipalities would be involved as partners or contributors with the conservation authorities, but not in areas that would still be considered to be within that essential mandate of the authority or with programs which would be delivered on a regional basis.

The member mentioned other agencies, and certainly another agency would be in the whole area of educational programming which was not part of the original mandate of authorities and might be worked in conjunction with school boards.

1510

TABLING OF INFORMATION

Mr McLean: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The point of order that I would like to raise is under standing order 95(d). On 20 June 1989 I tabled Orders and Notices questions 208, 209 and 210. These three questions were for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Question 208 asks the minister to provide a list of consultants' reports commissioned by his ministry in the fiscal years 1987-88 and 1988-89. Question 209 asks the

minister to state the current status of each of the consultants' reports commissioned by his ministry in fiscal years 1987-88 and 1988-89. Question 210 again asks the minister to provide the names of each of the consultants commissioned by his ministry in fiscal years 1987-88 and 1988-89, the total expenditure of each report and the details of the tendering process for each report, or if applicable, the reason why the contract was not up for tender.

Standing order 95(d) states:

"The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

An interim answer was given, that the approximate date when information would be available was 16 October 1989. Orders and Notices questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost a year since I tabled these questions and over six months since the date the information was supposed to be available.

The Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)6, states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is a refusal "to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof."

As a member of this assembly, I feel I have a right to access to information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this House are complied with. The government has shown blatant disrespect for standing orders by not answering this question. I ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: I listened very carefully to the honourable member, and I must congratulate him on his research and the length of time I am sure he took to prepare that point of order.

I know that Orders and Notices questions are put in Orders and Notices, and it certainly simplifies things, because usually they are there by number. Maybe it would be a little easier for the honourable member in the future to refer to the question number.

I believe the minister was listening very, very carefully to your submission. In case he was not, I will certainly, on your behalf, make certain that he is aware of your point of order.

PETITIONS

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr D. S. Cooke: I have another petition. It is very brief, so I will read it.

"To the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, hereby register our concern and protest over the exclusion of permanent mental disorders in the threshold definition of the new Ontario motorist protection plan.

"We respectfully request that the Legislature consider amendment of this proposed threshold definition to recognize the potential for permanent mental disorder resulting from a traumatic event such as an auto accident. To omit mental illness from the definition is discriminatory and implies that the resulting damages are neither substantive nor acceptable."

I have signed the petition, and it is signed by 127 people from Windsor.

Mr Dietsch: I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario with respect to the deep concerns and outrage over the provisions of the Ontario motorist protection plan. I have affixed my name to it in accordance with the standing order.

DIAPERS

Mr Kormos: I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It is a rather lengthy preamble, so I am not going to read every single word.

It makes reference to the huge amounts in tonnage of disposable diapers that go into landfills in Canada every year. It talks about the plastic covering on that diaper taking literally centuries to decompose; it talks about how hospital maternity wards, by using disposable diapers on healthy babies, are actually condoning the use of these disposables, and it talks about how new parents who want to properly care for their babies will often follow the hospital's example and therefore use these disposable diapers. It requests that the government of Ontario require Ontario hospitals to stop using disposable diapers on maternity wards within one year and to return to the use of cloth diapers. It is signed by six people from the Windsor area and, of course, by myself.

ASSISTANCE TO CHERNOBYL VICTIMS

Mr Jackson: Seldom do I get such a great privilege as to read into the record a petition that is so beautifully done by so many wonderful children in Ontario. They have put a lot of devoted effort and interest into this petition, and with your indulgence, Mr Speaker, I will read it into the record.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the tragic human and environmental aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster continues to affect the lives of thousands, especially children;

"Whereas the Soviet government has failed to take the necessary and sufficient steps to provide adequate medical and other forms of aid to the victims of Chernobyl; and

"Whereas Ontario has a distinguished international record as a leader in nuclear development, which also implies a responsibility in terms of support for victims of nuclear disasters when they occur;

"We, the undersigned, the children of Ukrainian Canadian ancestry in Metropolitan Toronto, beg leave to petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario come to the assistance of the victims of Chernobyl by collaborating with the federal government and the International Red Cross in providing training and advanced drugs useful in treating radiation-related illnesses to medical teams in Ukraine and by accepting for specialized treatment as many of the critically ill children living in the Chernobyl area as possible."

I have affixed my signature and would specifically like you, Mr Speaker—

The Speaker: I think it would be better if the table looked at them to see if they are in order.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Mr McCague from the standing committee on estimates presented the following interim report:

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday 3 May 1990 and notwithstanding standing orders 57 and 58, your committee has selected in the first round the estimates of the following ministries and offices for consideration:

The Ministry of Natural Resources, 7.5 hours; the office responsible for native affairs, 7.5 hours; the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, 7.5 hours; the Ministry of Skills Development, 7.5 hours; the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 7.5 hours, and the Ministry of Community and Social Services, 7.5 hours.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

HAREWOOD PARK ASSOCIATION ACT, 1990

Mr MacDonald moved first reading of Bill Pr67, An Act to revive the Harewood Park Association.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on government notice of motion 30 on time allocation in relation to Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance.

The Speaker: I believe the member for Leeds-Grenville adjourned the debate. He may wish to continue.

Mr Runciman: Thank you. I appreciate this opportunity once again to put the views of the Progressive Conservative Party on the record in respect to the time allocation motion that we are dealing with now, and as well, of course, tying it into the lack of opportunity for meaningful input on the part of the opposition parties in respect to the government's no-fault legislation, Bill 68.

1520

As members of this House will know, the government is, through this time allocation measure, attempting to muzzle the opposition, to limit the number of hours of debate in this Legislature, and perhaps more important, limit the number of intervenors in respect to members of the opposition who can participate in this debate and who can have the opportunity to put forward the views of many thousands of people across this province who have very serious and legitimate concerns about this legislation, about the no-fault initiative undertaken by this government. Most of the members of this opposition are not going to have an opportunity because of time allocation, because of this, in effect, closure effort by the Liberal government, this effort to throttle the opposition, to throttle the people of this province who want to be heard on this issue, people who have, as I said, some very legitimate concerns.

You may recall, Mr Speaker, last Thursday when I was discussing this issue I talked at some length about the abject failure of the Liberal members of this Legislature to speak up and speak out on behalf of their constituents—many, many constituents who have serious concerns about this legislation.

More specifically, I talked about the Liberal members who served on the standing committee on general government and who were a serious disappointment to me and I think to thousands of others who were hoping that those individuals would have what it takes to stand up and openly criticize their own government in respect to the failings of this legislation—

very obvious failings, Mr Speaker, when you realize that the no-fault initiative, based on the government's own actuarial studies, is going to reduce benefits to the people of this province by 47.7%. We are seeing a reduction in benefits of 47.7% and no reduction in rates. Many Ontarians are going to face significant rates. At the same time, we did not see one—not one—member of that Liberal Party on that particular committee standing up and taking issue with what this government was doing, this significant attack on rights of individuals and drivers across this province. Not one of them had what it takes to stand up and be heard.

I want to read into the record some testimony, and obviously I cannot read it all into the record, but it was certainly testimony that impacted on me, impacted on other members of the opposition, and it was by a young man who appeared before us, Jeremy Rempel. He appeared before us in a wheelchair. He had been the victim in a serious accident back in 1980. As I said, he presented perhaps some of the most moving testimony that I have heard in my years as a legislator.

After I read this brief excerpt into the record, I want to relate the reaction of the Liberal members who served on that committee and the kind of nonsensical, offensive sort of interventions we heard from those members, who did not seem to be moved, who did not seem to be terribly concerned about this individual and other individuals who appeared before us, such as Barbara Turnbull. I think most of us have heard of Barbara Turnbull, who appeared, thanks to the assistance of the member for Mississauga South, who has been a very good friend of Barbara Turnbull's and accompanied her on the day she appeared before the committee. Testimony by people like Barbara Turnbull and Jeremy Rempel had no impact at all.

Mr Faubert: Read her testimony. Read it into the record.

Mr Runciman: Again, Mr Speaker, we are having interventions from the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, who seems to have nothing better to do with his life than sit in this House day after day making inane interjections. When it comes to this legislation, we know that the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere is not a yes-man. He is not a yes-man. When the Premier says no, he will say no.

Mr Faubert: Exactly.

Mr Runciman: That is right, he is not a yes-man. He is a man of conviction.

Mr Faubert: What does this have to do with the debate?

Mr Runciman: He is a man of conviction. He is a man of conviction, that is, after he finds out what the Premier is thinking. Then he is a man of conviction.

I want to talk about Jeremy Rempel and his appearance before the committee. I will read this into the record, and I can provide this to Hansard, if indeed it requires it, but his appearance was on Tuesday 16 January 1990.

"Gentlemen, my name is Jeremy Rempel. I am 18 years old and was a victim of a bicycle/motor vehicle accident in 1980. I have had my terrible experience with the auto insurance industry and I have nothing to lose or gain personally by whatever form this legislation eventually takes. I am here, though, to speak for those 35 people each day in the province of Ontario who are involved in motor vehicle accidents in which they sustain brain injury. Why, you might ask, would I care about them?...

"Although you can see that I depend on a wheelchair to get around, those physical problems are very minimal....

"The impairment that keeps me from participating successfully in the academic world and the world of business and quick decision-making is the subtle damage that my brain experienced in the accident...."

"My IQ is the same as it ever was, be that high or low. I participate in my local high school and am successful in some classes. Because of this impairment, I cannot even attempt other classes...."

"Thirty-five people every day in Ontario will experience to some degree what I experienced. With the new legislation"—no-fault legislation—"the ones most physically damaged will be the lucky ones. Those who have had the ability to make decisions taken away but cannot prove it through pictures will have to argue very sophisticated scientific principles on their own against the insurance companies' doctors and lawyers, with all their resources...."

"Very simply and realistically speaking, those people I have described will no longer have the opportunity to bring an action against somebody who, through carelessness, destroyed an important part of their life. That is not right. As I stated earlier, I have had my experience; but when you consider that 14,000 people each year will follow me in the same unfortunate experience, it may very well be one of your children or one of your neighbour's children who will live in the condition that I live in and who will have no opportunity to attempt to recapture any decency to life by having the person who caused the accident take responsibility and have his or her insurance company assist him on his road back to a decent lifestyle."

Those are very brief excerpts from a very moving appearance before the committee. I want to say that it was the most moving, honest, heartfelt, and unlike a good degree of the testimony before us, certainly not self-serving in any way shape or form.

We had a number of individuals like Jeremy Rempel appearing before us, as I said earlier, who did not have any vested interests, had nothing to gain or lose by passage of this legislation, unless of course they were accident victims in the future, but their concern, very genuine concern, was, as I said, for innocent accident victims in the future, the many, many people who are going to suffer as a result of this Liberal government legislation.

The 3% to 5% who can pass through the threshold under this legislation are going to have to suffer very serious accidents indeed. As the government's own actuaries indicate, at least 95%, perhaps as high as 97% of innocent accident victims in this province in the future, when this legislation goes through, will not have the ability to take the wrongdoer to court, will not have the ability to take that at-fault driver to court, unless they are part of that very small, modest number of people who can break through the threshold.

That happens to be the reality. Some of the Liberal members can shake their heads, but they have not looked at this legislation, they have not looked at the actuarial reports, they really do not understand it. They have been swallowing the government guff, I guess. When you are whipped into line so often in respect to the position that you are supposed to put forward to your own constituents, I guess you get into the habit of simply saying—despite the facts, despite the very expert testimony, despite the government's own actuarial studies, they sit over there mumbling: "That's not right, that's not right, that's not right."

The facts are there for anyone who cares to take the time to review them. They will very clearly understand that the people of this province are the losers, very clear losers in respect to this

no-fault legislation. We may be fortunate enough never to suffer as a result of this legislation. Let's hope most of us in this assembly and in many others will not be in the kind of serious auto accidents that occur in this province, but we know that thousands of people will be and if it may not be us as individuals, at some point it may indeed affect our friends or families, people whom we genuinely care about. This kind of action will come home to roost. The government will really feel, when that occurs, just what it has done, what the impact is to people across this province, how seriously it has damaged and cut out rights that they have had in this province and in this country for years and years, which this government is now pulling away from them, pulling away from all of us as residents of this province.

It is the most onerous threshold in North America in any jurisdiction that has no-fault, and the toughest legislation in respect to people's ability to sue. We have the member for Brampton South here and he is one who should have some familiarity with this. He is one of those people whom you would suspect, based on his record in the previous Legislature, I guess between 1985 and 1987, when he did stand up and on occasion take on some of his colleagues in the executive council, but we certainly have seen a much quieter member for Brampton South since the 1987 election.

1530

An hon member: He's older.

Mr Runciman: Older, wiser? Well, I guess it goes with the fact that, after a while, when you are sitting with such a huge majority and you are part of that as a backbencher, you wonder whether it is worth while banging your head against the wall, whether your own constituents are going to support you if indeed you take those kinds of stands. I have been down that road myself. I have spoken to this issue.

When I took issue with Mr Davis's purchase of 25% of Suncor, I stood up for what I believed in and what I felt was right, and I think time has proven me correct in respect to that. But at the time, and in the years that followed, I wondered whether it was something I should have done in respect to the way you are treated by your government colleagues, the way it forecloses a lot of opportunities for personal growth in respect to moving up the ladder into the executive council if you wish to do that.

Also, perhaps even most important in respect to this, I talked about disillusionment among the electorate the other day, because we see the sheeplike kind of approach by the Liberal members. And we see it at the federal level; I am not going to stand here and say that it does not occur in the Conservative government at the federal level. As members know, I do not pull my punches in respect to that either. I want to say at the same time that I have some reservations in respect to how the electorate will treat people who do that. We look at Mr Kindy and Mr Kilgour at the federal level, who voted against the GST. It is going to be most interesting to see how their constituents treat them in the next election, if they are running as independents.

I have some concern about that, and I guess that has to be the concern of someone like the member for Brampton South, who I think probably has some strong concerns about this legislation, but for his own reasons, after having sat in the Liberal caucus for a number of years now, he knows that it is probably not going to do him any good to stand up and take a strong stand. If indeed that is the way he is feeling, it is regrettable and it speaks volumes about the weaknesses of the parliamentary system in Canada.

I could speak on this at some other point, but I can go on at length about the weaknesses and how they can be corrected, and how we can identify in a throne speech issues of confidence upon which a government would fall. All other introductions of government legislation would not be matters of confidence and could be turned back at caucus, could be turned back in the House, without having a government fall. That is the sort of thing that I would like to see occur in Canada, but it may be wishful thinking because we certainly do not see any initiatives like that being considered at this point.

Also, when we talk about Bill 68 and time allocation, another measure that would perhaps encourage government backbenchers to play a more active role in the critical scrutiny of legislation brought forward by their own executive council might be the option of a referendum. Again, Mr Speaker, you may recall back, I think, to 1986 when I introduced referendum legislation which would have allowed referendums on issues like no-fault auto insurance and a number of other, perhaps more controversial, issues in respect to matters that raise passions in this province. But I think what we are talking about is perhaps the ultimate in democracy.

Mr Faubert: Nonsense.

Mr Runciman: I know that the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere has trouble with the whole idea of democracy when we are talking about the way this kind of legislation is being shoved through the House, this time allocation motion we are talking about here, when the government limits the opposition to two days in committee of the whole House to put forward a number of significant amendments.

Mr Faubert: Two days? You've wasted three weeks.

Mr Runciman: I can understand the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere's concerns and points of view when I start talking about democracy and giving the people the opportunity to have a voice in issues like this when obviously they are not being represented by people like that member and many other members of the Liberal caucus.

I want to draw to the attention of the viewers, not so much the House, a number of people who have been involved in this exercise and perhaps encourage their constituents to give them a call in respect to this matter.

I spoke the other day about Sterling Campbell, the member for Sudbury. I hope the viewers can see that phone number. It is 963-3814 in Sudbury. I want to talk about the relevance—

Mr D. W. Smith: That's inappropriate.

Hon Mr Elston: That's out of order.

Mr Runciman: This is obviously agitating a few members of the Liberal caucus. That is indeed regrettable, to see them agitated about putting a Liberal member's name and phone number before the public of Ontario through the parliamentary broadcasting effort. Can you believe it, Mr Speaker, that some of these members are agitated by that? It is difficult to understand this.

The Speaker: I am really terribly sorry to interrupt the member's comments. However, I have tried on a number of occasions to explain to members that props, and particularly large props, are not particularly appropriate here. There is certainly no standing order that says that, but, particularly when you are using other members' names, I think I would reconsider it.

Mr Runciman: I am not prepared to reconsider it. If you are going to find me out of order, I will do that, but I think this

is an extremely important piece of legislation. I want to emphasize to you, Mr Speaker, that the opposition—and I am talking about the Progressive Conservative Party in this particular opportunity; I cannot speak for the official opposition. I have spoken on this a little over two hours. We are talking about an extremely important matter, which the government is not allowing us to debate in committee beyond the two-day limitation that this motion allocates.

One of the important elements of my comments and one of the important elements of my contribution here today is the fact that the government members who served on that committee, the government members who have made their views known in respect to this issue—because we do not have the other opportunity, I have to make the public aware as best I can. I think that is my responsibility.

I am not going to take a significant amount of time. I have about six or seven cards here, but it certainly is my intention to proceed. I can understand and appreciate your difficulties with this, but certainly the member for Welland-Thorold was using the Premier's number and other numbers. If you find me out of order, Mr Speaker, there is not much I can do; I simply will not proceed. But if indeed you think it is something that should be dealt with that is not covered under the standing orders, which you have indicated, perhaps it is something that should be taken up by the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly and considered as a restriction.

I want to see those kinds of things apply to all members of the House and not simply because I come here today with something that may be a little bit larger than someone else used, that I am going to be restricted from doing the same sort of thing, which I think is especially important, given the restrictions on time that this motion places upon us as members of the opposition.

That is my explanation, Mr Speaker. If you want to intervene further, obviously you have the power to do so.

1540

The Speaker: Thank you. I would be very happy to make a further comment and submission to the honourable member. I believe the honourable member would agree with me that the main purpose that a person has for being in this place is to debate. The honourable member has, as other members have, used other members' names and tried to put comments referring to other members in Hansard. I certainly do not hesitate about that, but I really hesitate when the honourable member stands up with a sign and a member's name. I know the telephone number stuff has been used, but I would appreciate very much if the member would refrain from using names on signs.

Mr Runciman: Mr Speaker, I am going to reach what I call a compromise. You may not recognize it as a compromise. I am going to use one name and one phone number and then I will put it down. As you say, this does not violate the standing orders. I am doing this in respect to the views that you have offered here today.

I am going to just put the one up here. It is a gentleman by the name of Chris Ward, the government House leader, who has introduced this time allocation legislation which is restricting the opposition to two days of committee-of-the-whole debate on this most important legislation.

I want to say the government has a significant number of amendments to offer to this legislation; this opposition party, the Conservative Party, also has a significant number of amendments. We are not going to have an opportunity to meaningfully debate those because of only two days being allotted us. I can

look across here at 19 members of the New Democratic Party and 17 members of the Conservative caucus representing thousands and thousands of people across this province who are not going to have an opportunity to be heard through their members because the Liberal members of this House are not going to speak up and offer that kind of criticism.

Call this gentleman and tell him you do not like it, it is wrong for the people of the province of Ontario. The Liberal government is acting incorrectly. They should be ashamed in respect to what they are doing to the opposition and what they are doing to the thousands of concerned Ontarians in this province. They are cutting off debate, they are choking it off and not allowing us to really have an opportunity to express those very legitimate, valid concerns of thousands and thousands of Ontarians.

An hon member: What number, Bob, what number?

Mr Runciman: It is 965-1101. Call the Liberal House leader. Let him know what you think about this.

Mr Speaker, I made some assurances to you and to your predecessor in the chair in respect to holding up cards with members' names on it, so I am not going to hold up the card with members' names on it. I am going to respect the views of the Speaker, but I will mention the names.

Another member of the committee, who sat through the hearings and was not prepared to intervene in a supportive way in respect to the overwhelming amount of testimony that criticized this legislation—even the parliamentary assistant to the minister said we were, I think, to paraphrase, stomped, we were really kicked around the place by the people who appeared before us because, as I said, the overwhelming amount of testimony was against this. The evidence was against this. Even the government's own actuarial studies indicated this is a bad deal for Ontarians.

Murad Velshi, who is sitting in the House today, the member for Don Mills—

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): Order, please. The honourable member and I had the opportunity of discussing this the other day. Now that the Speaker has also indicated some concern, I think we should be a little more specific in terms of the standing orders and refer only to members' ridings and not their names.

Mr Runciman: Mr Speaker, I will say, "The member for Don Mills." I do not think it is inappropriate in this House to say "Mr Velshi." The member for Don Mills, Mr Velshi, whose phone number is 965-9790—

Mr Velshi: Bob, tell about—

Mr Runciman: I want to say he is sitting in the back rows here today trying to drown me out because obviously he is embarrassed and ashamed of his own lack of action, his lack of intestinal fortitude, his unwillingness to stand up on behalf of the people he is supposed to be representing in this assembly. All he can do here today is yammer at me, sitting behind my shoulder. Because of this huge Liberal government, they have taken over part of this side of the House.

They are even trying to interfere with the limited opportunity that the opposition members have. We have been given two days, and this member has the gall—he does not have the guts to stand up in committee or in this House and say, "I'm concerned about this legislation," but he can come in here with the limited time we have available and try to interfere and try to object and try to obstruct my opportunity, limited opportunity as it is, to speak out on behalf of the thousands of people in this

province who are concerned and to speak out on behalf of all the opposition members who are being cut off and cut out by this Liberal government's initiative. That is a reality.

I want to say that I want to be responsible in respect to my contribution to this debate, but if I have to put up with asinine comments like that character's, I want to tell you, Mr Speaker, I may not continue to be responsible in respect to my contribution. The members can shake their heads over there but I want to tell you I do not have much respect for any of the people on the Liberal government's side of the House who sat in that committee and could not make one meaningful word of contribution, none at all. They should be ashamed to even be sitting in this House to carry on. They have the gall to come in here and intervene and criticize because I am pointing out to their own constituents their own failures in respect to intervening and making a stand on behalf of their own constituents, let alone the innocent accident victims across this province in the future if this no-fault legislation goes through. It is pretty distasteful, to say the least.

I want to mention someone whom I do have a great deal of respect for in respect to what I have heard him say and what he has done in this House and some of the challenges that have faced him as a member, and that is the member for Windsor-Walkerville, Michael Ray. I did have a letter that Mr Ray wrote, and I was unable to find it the other day. Hopefully I will be able to find it today and put some of it on the record.

Mr Ray, the member for Windsor-Walkerville, is writing to David Greenaway, who is a solicitor in Windsor, Ontario, making reference that:

"I can assure you, as an elected representative who endured an election where auto insurance was an important issue, that the public have found the existing system of insurance with its increasing premiums intolerable and unacceptable. Some moderation in premium increases can only be achieved by reducing benefits to some policyholders, which is what the government proposes to do."

I want to repeat that: "Some moderation in premium increases can only be achieved by reducing benefits to some policyholders, which is what the government proposes to do, while requiring insurance companies provide optional coverage for those who wish to purchase coverages above the minimum standards of the government proposal.

"I share your concerns about the forgiveness of OHIP payments and the elimination of the 3% insurance premium tax. The government says forgiveness of subrogation payments is consistent with the recent elimination of all OHIP premiums for all residents of Ontario. The 3% insurance premium tax has been an income tax deduction for commercial auto insurance policyholders but not for individuals. To remove the inequity, the government proposes elimination of the premium tax.

"In my view, wage losses and all out-of-pocket expenses should be fully compensated by the plan"—which it does not do—"and one should not be required to purchase optional coverage for this benefit. I have communicated this view to the minister.

"Similarly, I believe amendment to the definition of the threshold is necessary to clarify recovery for mental or psychological injury and for serious physical injuries which are not permanent."

That is very strongly in opposition to and disagreement with the legislation. The member for Windsor-Walkerville is clearly on the record, in writing, saying, "I believe amendment to the definition of the threshold is necessary to clarify recovery for

mental or psychological injury and for serious physical injuries which are not permanent."

That is interesting. I appreciate Mr Ray taking a stand like that. It certainly stands out when you compare the lack of effort and the lack of stands being taken by other backbench members of this Liberal government. I guess that if I have one disappointment about what has transpired in respect to the member for Windsor-Walkerville, it is the fact that he has not publicly reiterated the views he expressed in that letter, and for reasons known best to him.

Mr Philip: Albert Roy did.

Mr Runciman: Albert Roy did? Well, I would rather hear the member for Windsor-Walkerville expressing and reiterating them, in this House preferably, in some public forum, so that, again, the people of Ontario can appreciate that there are concerns within the Liberal caucus. Other than the member for Windsor-Walkerville, we certainly do not hear it coming from anyone else. So I encourage the member for Windsor-Walkerville to take a public stand. Once again, I want to say to any of his constituents in the Windsor-Walkerville riding who may be watching these proceedings to phone your member, the member for Windsor-Walkerville, at 965-9605 and encourage him to state his concerns publicly about this legislation, the harm it is going to do to innocent accident victims across this province, and especially his reference to the elimination of psychological injury from the threshold.

1550

We have one of these gentlemen in the House. I have been known to go on a rant about his performance on occasion, that is, the member for York Mills. As I said, he seemed to be the government's chief cook and bottle washer on the committee, calling the shots—

Interjection.

Mr Runciman: We know that he still has aspirations for cabinet. With the Supreme Court decision in respect to Patti Starr, who knows? It may indeed occur, because I gather we are never going to find out the real facts in respect to Mrs Starr and the various significant contributions made by charities to a variety of Liberal members, including the member for York Mills.

In any event, he certainly played a key role on the committee in respect to cracking the whip on the Liberal members, making sure they stayed in line. From the perspective of the government, I guess you can say he did a good job.

Mr Velshi: Bill 68 is a good bill, Bob. Nobody cracked the whip.

Mr Runciman: That is pretty funny. Again, the intervention is from the member for Don Mills who is trying to convince himself, I guess, because he is certainly not going to convince anyone else.

When you look at the testimony before that committee, we had about 95% of the witnesses appearing before us strongly opposed to this legislation. But that member continues to try, as best he can, to justify his own lack of action, his own intestinal fortitude, his own—who can say why? I am not going to try to attribute motives to these individuals. I am not going to get involved in that again today anyway.

I want to say that the member for York Mills was one of the most vocal supporters of this legislation and one of the people who, in respect to my efforts to have a witness appear before us for 15 minutes to talk about some 39 actuarial studies dropped

on our lap on the last public hearing day, tried to restrict the opportunity for an expert witness to spend 15 minutes giving us his observations of those 39 actuarial and other studies. That is the kind of approach the member for York Mills took.

I want to encourage again any constituents in the York Mills area, who are represented by the member for York Mills, to try to call his office, 965-0279, and encourage him to reconsider the position, to stand up on behalf of the people of his own riding, people who may be innocent accident victims in the province in the future, and to take a stronger stand, a strong stand—let's take any stand—that may be constructively critical of what this government is trying to do through no-fault legislation.

This is another one that—I can do a rant on this, but I am going to try to preserve my voice for a while. I have already spoken at length about the member for Etobicoke West whose most important contribution to this debate was a 20-minute intervention against me, trying to call me to order for making some comment she felt was not complimentary of a certain cabinet minister. She inferred that. There were no names mentioned. But that was in respect to her priorities, looking at this legislation. While having people like Barbara Turnbull appear before us, this member for Etobicoke West could only find her most important contribution to the committee was to chastise me.

Mr Philip: I resent that. She was uncomplimentary of me also.

Mr Runciman: Maybe the member will have an opportunity to talk about that.

The member for Etobicoke West spent about 20 minutes chastising me instead of offering constructive questions, questions that would assist all of us in respect to learning what the impact of this legislation was going to be in the future on those impacted by psychological injuries and their inability to pass the threshold and to sue at-fault drivers.

We could have talked about the frequency of accidents on our highways, which will increase under no-fault. We could have talked about a whole host of things. We could have talked about the significant costs to taxpayers by the establishment of the dispute resolution system that this government is proposing and the new bureaucracy that that will entail. We could have talked about the significant amounts of money, the millions of dollars being transferred to the insurance industry. But no, the member for Etobicoke West, chose perhaps for her lengthiest intervention a bit of a tirade against me for what she perceived to be some sort of an insult against a cabinet minister.

I think that speaks volumes about that member's priorities and her role in that committee, and the role of all Liberal members in that committee. The committee was struck and assigned that responsibility reluctantly. We know the government did not want that bill to go out to public hearings. We knew that they wanted the bill to pass by December 1. They had preliminary rate filings set through the Ontario Gazette for the end of December. Their whole planning process did not involve any meaningful public input. So we know what the role of those backbenchers was, and it was certainly confirmed by the actions or lack of actions or the lack of significant input by the members I have mentioned up to this point, and certainly by the member for Etobicoke West.

Anyone who is a resident in Etobicoke West may want to call the member and ask her why she did not speak up on behalf of innocent accident victims. They should get an explanation from her and ask her why she is supporting legislation that is

going to see a 47.7% reduction in benefits. That is a government actuarial study. I want the member's constituents to ask her, "Why are you supporting a plan that's going to see an almost 50% reduction in our benefits and we are all going to see increases in our rates?"

In Etobicoke West they are going to see rate increases, even if we accept the government's figure, of an average of 8%. They are going to see close to 50% of their benefits lost, increases of at least 8% on average, and the member supported that. She never offered one critical word; not one critical word. If you are in Etobicoke West and you are wondering what she was doing there, what she was being paid for, why she was receiving that extra—what is it?—\$75 a day that members are paid, plus expenses—\$100 a day, tax-free. She was getting 100 bucks tax-free to sit there. What was she doing?

Hon Mr Elston: And so were you.

Mr Runciman: Listen, I am being told I was getting the same. You bet I was getting the same. One hundred bucks a day tax-free, and what was she doing? We are talking about an almost 50% reduction in benefits and significant increases to a lot of the residents in her riding.

Hon Mr Elston: What were you doing? You weren't showing up for most of the time.

Mr Runciman: I was there criticizing it. I was trying to tear it apart. I was trying to get the government to change. I was trying to get those Liberal government members on that committee to listen to reason and to pay attention to the witnesses, but they would not do it.

What did the member for Etobicoke West do? She took up 20 minutes to criticize me. That was it. That was the most important contribution she could make during that committee process for her 100 bucks tax-free per day. Pretty sad, pretty sad indeed.

If anyone wants to take a look at contributions, wants to review Hansard, wants to review the contributions made by the member for Welland-Thorold and the member for Leeds-Grenville and compare them to the contributions of members on the Liberal government side, I am open to that. If anyone wants to take a look, take a look. I am not embarrassed about my contribution on that committee, not one iota, not one bit.

1600

Mr J. B. Nixon: On a point of order and a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: The member for Leeds-Grenville, whom I will not call by name, has made a number of allegations about the behaviour of members of this committee, myself included. I would urge you to review the Hansard of the committee and you will find out that no deals were broken as he alleges. All deals were honoured, so what he tells you now is wrong.

Second, I think if you review Hansard, you will find that I personally moved well over 20 amendments to this legislation, and the member for Etobicoke West and the member for Don Mills and so on voted for those amendments improving the legislation and responding to the concerns expressed at the committee by interest groups. No amendments were moved by the opposition parties, none. They would not—

Mr Kormos: Do you believe that, Mr Speaker? Only a fool would believe that.

The Acting Speaker: Order. In my quick evaluation, it was not a legitimate—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Gentlemen.

Mr Pouliot: One buys out, the other buys back in.

The Acting Speaker: Gilles, please, allow me to continue if I might.

The honourable member for York Mills rose on a point of order. After listening very closely, in my evaluation, it was more information for us. It is difficult for the Chair to evaluate in terms of what took place on the committee. Maybe tonight, having nothing better to do, I will pull out the Hansards on the committee and review them, but I am not promising because we are going to have trouble enough taking place on what is happening here today and probably in the next few days to come.

Mr Runciman: That was indicative of the kind of contribution the Liberal members made throughout the course of those hearings: nothing whatsoever to do with the legislation. In point of fact, what the member says is faulty. He says there was no deal reneged on. Who else was in that committee who recalls what occurred?

The member himself came out to me afterwards and he indicated he regretted what had occurred during the committee and what had occurred in respect to a deal that had been made earlier in respect to my giving up my questioning time. When the rotation came around, he challenged it and did not want to go ahead with the deal. The only reason it did not go ahead was that there were not enough Liberal members in the committee to carry it. That is the only reason.

Mr J. B. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think I will ask you to review Hansard, because at the point that the member for Leeds-Grenville is referring to, you will see that the witness that the member for Leeds-Grenville wanted to appear before the committee did appear before the committee. What you will see is that all I said was, "I am concerned about the appropriateness."

That is as far as I got when the member, in a fit of lunacy, of rage, exploded, and it was on the TV cameras for us to see. He nearly had a heart attack. I went and apologized to him for actually saying something. This man rises in fits of temper if you say you are concerned about the appropriateness of things. Now he calls it a broken deal.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. Come on. No, I will not be reviewing Hansard. You can participate in the debate as your time comes around for rotation.

Mr Runciman: The member for York Mills is so big-headed he cannot get an Aspirin to fit him. That is the reality, and we all know that. I think if anyone wants to review Hansard—

Mr Kormos: I would be glad to mail it to him.

Mr Runciman: Certainly the member for Welland-Thorold was there and I believe the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale was present when that occurred.

Once again, to put my recollection on the record, we had an agreement that I would give up my questioning time and we went on the rotation. Then the member for York Mills intervened with an objection after he had made the agreement, and I indeed did lose my temper because we were talking about 15 modest minutes.

We had 39 very comprehensive studies piled in front of us on the last day of public hearings and I had asked for 15 minutes of expert testimony to critically analyse those reports

tabled on the last day of public hearings. He reluctantly agreed to it. When the rotation came around, the Chairman called for the expert witness and the member for York Mills expressed his concerns.

Can you blame me, Mr Speaker, for losing my temper? Anyone under those circumstances would lose his temper. I want to say, the obstructionist efforts, particularly of the member for York Mills, were very upsetting to all of us, and we talk about the way the members of the opposition carried on in that committee.

That was the most frustrating experience I have ever had as a member of the opposition, when we have, as I said before, witness after witness after witness to some of the most moving testimony—people who had no axe to grind, people who were genuinely, legitimately concerned about future innocent accident victims—having their testimony totally ignored, inane questions and the kinds of comments that we heard from that member, the member for Etobicoke West and the member for Hamilton Centre.

Certainly anyone who followed those hearings throughout their course, throughout the process, could fully understand the real frustration of opposition members who were genuinely moved by that testimony, wanted to see something happen and wanted to hear some word of recognition from the Liberal members that they understood, that they empathized, that they sympathized and that they were willing to do something about what this no-fault legislation was going to do to innocent accident victims.

But there was absolutely nothing at all, and we see the member for Etobicoke West taking up 20 minutes, as the member for York Mills just took up the time of the House, on a tirade against me instead of intervening in a constructive way. Etobicoke West constituents, if you are concerned about your member supporting an almost 50% reduction in your benefits and a significant increase in your insurance rates, give her a call at 965-7600. Let her hear from you. Let her know that you are not happy with the job she has not been doing for you.

I cannot say an awful lot about this gentleman because he was not on the hearings process for too long. Again, he is someone I personally like and respect. I think he could have made a significant contribution but, once again, I gather for reasons of his own, and we can only speculate about what those reasons might have been, he did not make that kind of contribution. I am talking about the member for Brampton North, who participated in the committee as a substitute, I think. Again, for the most part, like many of the members, he was a lump on the log. There was not any careful scrutiny of most of the witnesses. There were a couple of occasions when he did intervene with some of the expert witnesses in respect to the insurance industry.

Mr Neumann: Sometimes silence is golden, but you will never understand that.

Mr Runciman: In opposition it certainly is not.

In any event, I hope the constituents of Brampton North will phone their member at 965-1013. He sat through a lot of the hearings. He has a good understanding of this legislation and its impact on innocent accident victims, what its impact is on all of us as drivers in this province, how it is going to impact on rates, how it is going to impact on benefits and how it is going to impact on the rights of Ontarians. He did not speak up. Now is your opportunity to get after him. Urge the member for Brampton North to do it, at 965-1013.

This is a lady whom I have spoken about—again, I can do this at length and I do not want to do it, because I want to get into some of the substantive amendments that we are going to be proposing; if the government members want to encourage me, who knows, maybe I will—the member for Hamilton Centre. She is in the House today. This may be the first time I have spoken about her performance since she has been in the House, I am not sure.

Mr Polsinelli: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I refer to standing order 23(b). As you know, Mr Speaker, the standing order indicates that the Speaker shall call a member to order if the member “directs his or her speech to matters other than the question under discussion.” The Speaker is also aware that the question under discussion is the adjourned debate on government notice of motion 30 on time allocation. The member for Leeds-Grenville, who has the floor, has indicated on a number of occasions that he is talking about Bill 68, and as a matter of fact just before I rose on my point of order the member indicated very numerous amendments he is going to be talking to, referring to Bill 68.

Mr Speaker, I urge you to maintain the standing orders of the House and call the member for Leeds-Grenville to order and ask him to confine his debate to the motion presently under discussion.

1610

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member for Yorkview has brought our standing orders to my attention, and actually I have been remiss and I thank the honourable member. He is correct.

I have to say to the honourable member for Leeds-Grenville that you have been, shall I say, straying afar from the motion at hand, and you of all people know only too well that there are ways and manners of doing what you are attempting to do. If you are going to abide by the standing orders, which I would ask you to do, I think you should take heed of what the honourable member for Yorkview has indicated.

Mr Pouliot: On the same point of order, Mr Speaker: I have been listening meticulously to every word that has been said, and I would like to draw to your attention, sir, with high respect, that there is a certain interesting methodology. Not only do things need to be said, but there is a connection, and I am very sorry that a member on the government side has chosen to ignore this. Meticulously, the member who had the floor previously has provided us with consistent adherence not only to the rules of procedure, but to the motion being addressed on the floor.

I, for one, was hanging on every word until this untimely interruption. I do not wish to impute motive, but I see this kind of endeavour as not only regressive, but maybe as an attempt to stall, to buy time for the government. Yet to stop the flow of the honourable member is indeed incorrect and the member should be ashamed and corrected.

Mr Philip: On the point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: I have to say to the honourable member for Etobicoke-Rexdale that having had the opportunity of listening in rotation in terms of this particular point of order, it would probably be more appropriate if I heard from the member for Leeds-Grenville, but only because I have utmost respect for the honourable member will I allow you a small point of order.

Mr Philip: I have been listening very attentively to the member for Leeds-Grenville. He has been debating whether or not there should be time allocation. I believe he has been arguing that the Liberal members on the committee did not choose, for whatever reason, to participate in the debate in that committee. He is arguing that the time allocation motion should not be passed because he wants to give them an opportunity to participate in a full and open debate, which they refused to participate in in the committee. So, with respect, I believe that he is speaking to the—

The Acting Speaker: I beg to differ—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: No, that is it for the member for Welland-Thorold. I think I have heard from you enough. I will recognize the honourable member for Simcoe East. Come on. It is getting out of hand.

Mr McLean: Mr Speaker, I want to rise on the point of order from the member for Yorkview, who indicated that you should be enforcing the rules and the laws of this Legislature. I rose this afternoon on a point of order under section 95 of our rules to make sure that the Speaker did enforce the rules and the laws of this Legislature. I seem to be having a problem getting answers to Orders and Notices questions, so, Mr Speaker, when you want to talk about enforcing the rules, I think you will maybe have to have time to check the rules to be able to deliberate whether what he is doing is proper or not.

The Acting Speaker: As if we have nothing better to do all day. But going with the flow, the honourable member for Yorkview, would you like to further express your concerns about the standing order?

Mr Polsinelli: Perhaps I can say one thing. The events of the past few weeks have quite seriously caused an embarrassment for me as a member of this House. I think the actions that have been undertaken by the members of the opposition, the stalling actions with respect to this bill, have caused me to be embarrassed to be a member of this House.

The Acting Speaker: One more round, the member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Kormos: The point of order, Mr Speaker, is that this government's own boards, Mr Justice Osborne, have rejected threshold auto insurance and this government insists on trying to ram it through this Legislature, notwithstanding—

The Acting Speaker: Order. The member for Hastings-Peterborough, for the final concluding remarks.

Mr Pollock: Mr Speaker, I do not believe there is a quorum present.

The Acting Speaker: Innovative announcement. Is there a quorum present?

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville.

Mr Runciman: I appreciate the intervention of the member for Yorkview. We rarely hear from him. He has sort of disappeared in the last two years. It reminds me that there is an old line, "He's so dull, he looks forward to dental appointments," that might apply to the member for Yorkview.

Mr Speaker, I appreciate your comments and I am not going to continue this line for much longer. I can relate to what you

are saying and to what the member for Yorkview said, but I think, again, that this is an important element of the debate on time allocation.

We are talking about the fact that has been not enough meaningful debate on Bill 68, the no-fault legislation. What this no-fault bill is doing, Mr Speaker, as you fully understand, is restricting debate. It is not only restricting it in terms of committee of the whole and the opportunity for amendments and full debate on the amendments, but what it is doing is cutting off the members of the opposition, Her Majesty's loyal opposition, who are not having an opportunity to be heard.

I think that has to be the overriding concern. When I talk about the lack of participation, the lack of meaningful debate by Liberal members in the House, of course, but also, and more important, in committee, I think it is an important ingredient of the argument I am trying to put forward to the House with respect to time allocation and the fact that so much time of the members was wasted by the Liberal members. There was no effort, no real interest in listening, in acting upon what they heard.

All of those people who appeared before us have a right to be upset that their concerns were not heeded by the Liberals, but they have an even greater right to be concerned about the fact that they are not going to have the opportunity to have those concerns voiced in this House by the members of the opposition because of this time allocation legislation, this closure, this effort to cut off the opposition from the opportunity to have meaningful input.

I want to say briefly that another member of that committee was the member for Hamilton Centre. I have said this to her; she knows this is no secret. When the committee started its hearings, I was optimistic about her participation because of her background in the field with respect to work with the head-injured. I felt there were some public comments out there as well so that she might be receptive to seeing some significant changes, that she had some legitimate concerns about this legislation.

I want to say, as I said during the committee hearings process and as I have said in this House, that she was perhaps one of the most significant disappointments to me with respect to Liberal members by the fact that she simply did not play an important or meaningful role in the committee, in my view. She may have another view of that, and perhaps some of her colleagues, Liberal members from whom we have heard interjections today, may have another point of view.

We have the member for Yorkview saying he is embarrassed by the actions of the opposition. My, oh my, that gentleman should look in the mirror. If he wants to be embarrassed, he should be embarrassed by the actions of this government in bringing in no-fault legislation that is going to cut benefits to drivers in this province by close to 50% and increase rates in most areas of the province by a significant margin. He says he is ashamed by the opposition's efforts to be heard on this issue, to represent the interests of all of those thousands of people who have concerns, and he is ashamed of us, not of his own actions or lack of actions.

1620

What has he said on this legislation? Does he care enough to stand up in this House and speak? Does he appreciate the fact that he is not going to have an opportunity either, even if he cared to, because of this government's effort to cut off debate? Does he care about that? No, he has the gall to stand up and say he is embarrassed by the opposition's efforts to be heard, by the

opposition's efforts to represent the views of concerned people who appeared before the committee, witness after witness who pointed out the failings of this legislation, and now, after being ignored in committee, are not even going to have an opportunity to have those concerns voiced by the opposition members through meaningful committee of the whole House, through opportunities for debate on amendments that we are hoping to put forward—I think some 20. It leaves one shaking one's head, the fact that the Liberal members can stand up and make comments like that.

Again, I do not want to get into detail about the member for Hamilton Centre. I indicated my great disappointment with her failure to speak out, especially on behalf of the head-injured in this province. She did not do it and I want to encourage all of her constituents in Hamilton Centre—she is facing some difficulties with her own riding association, I understand, because of her failure to act on this legislation. Again, I am not going to attribute motives. I do not know why she took the stand or lack of stand that she took, why she did not stand up. She has been removed from cabinet. She is not an executive council member. There are very slim odds indeed that she will see a return to cabinet, so I think that if one person over there who could set aside ambition—

Mr Neumann: She has better odds than you do.

Mr Runciman: I have already been there, unlike the member, I might say.

One person who could set aside ambition would be the member for Hamilton Centre, but we did not see that occur. I urge her constituents, the members of her riding association, the members of the Liberal riding association out there, to contact the member's office. Let her know how you feel about her not saying anything about your benefits being reduced almost 50% and your car insurance rates going up at least 8%. She did not say a thing in your defence. She did not speak out. She did not stand up for you, not one word in your defence, in defence of innocent accident victims in this province, in defence of the head-injured, the people who are going to suffer psychological injury, who will have no ability to sue an at-fault driver because of this legislation, the 95% of Ontarians who will no longer have the right to take an at-fault driver to court. They will lose that and the member for Hamilton Centre did not say one word in defence of all those thousands of people across this province, not one word.

If you care in her riding, if you care about her failure to act on your behalf, give her a call, give her office a call and let her know. It is not too late. This legislation has not passed the House. It is not too late.

We are dealing with a restriction on the time to debate this. If you can put pressure on your member, if she is there to represent your interests as she said she was going to when she ran for election in 1985, maybe you can get her to act. Maybe you can get her to stand up on behalf of you and the other people in your riding, the other people in your community, the other people in this province who are genuinely concerned about the impact of this legislation, about the way it is going to hurt people, and I mean hurt people, right across this province.

If you care, call the member for Hamilton Centre at 965-4820 in Toronto. Give her a call. Get that phone. Call her right now at 965-4820. It is important. This legislation has not gone through yet. If she wants to represent you, if she wants your vote in the next election, let her know: "Stand up for me. Stand up for the innocent accident victims across this province. Stand up for the head-injured. Stand up for all those people who are

not going to have the opportunity to take at-fault drivers to court. It is all lost." Get after the member for Hamilton Centre. Call her right now at 965-4820.

One more comment about a committee member and then I will move on to other matters: I probably will not get as agitated as I just did with respect to the previous committee member, the member for Hamilton Centre, because as I said earlier, I was extremely disappointed about her failure to perform and her failure to represent, especially, the head-injured. Perhaps she may have an opportunity at some point to explain her lack of action in that respect and I hope she does. I have not heard anything from her with respect to this up to this point. Perhaps the government will be generous if we get through this time allocation and will give her an opportunity to speak during committee of the whole.

I want to say that given the government's restrictions on time, she is not going to have much time and I think she would need an awful lot of time indeed to explain her lack of action with respect to all of those thousands of people across this province who were counting on her, who were counting on a handful of Liberal members to be sensitive enough to this issue, to be concerned enough about innocent accident victims so that they were prepared to take a tough stand, prepared to say to the Premier, the guy who is responsible for this mess we are in with automobile insurance—there is no doubt about it; the Premier of the province, the head of the Liberal Party of Ontario, is responsible for this.

We on the opposition side were all hoping, and many others across this province, that there would be one, two or three Liberal members on that committee who would say, especially after all that moving testimony: "We are not going to take this. We are going to stand up and speak out. We are going to be heard. It may mean a promotion. It may mean a cabinet job. But I am here to represent those people. I know what we are doing is wrong and I am going to say so."

It did not happen, and as I said, I was most disappointed in the member for Hamilton Centre. I am not going to get as agitated about this next gentleman who did not make—well, I am not sure if he spoke. He may have spoken briefly in the committee. He may have asked what the next meeting date was or some such thing. I am not sure. That is the member for Mississauga East, who I might say defeated an outstanding member of this Legislature. It is certainly regrettable that Bud Gregory is no longer with us, because I want tell the constituents, the people of Mississauga East, that if Bud Gregory were in this House he would not be sitting on his hands in that committee. He would not be sitting silent.

Bud Gregory would be speaking out. Bud Gregory had a record of speaking out. He had the intestinal fortitude to speak out. He would stand up and be heard. He would not let his own government, his own colleagues run roughshod over innocent accident victims in this province, unlike the current member for Mississauga East who sat on his hands and sat quietly through the proceedings. I am not sure if he said anything or not. I would have to consult Hansard, because if he did make a contribution it certainly escapes memory. There is no doubt about it: Bud Gregory would have been heard from. Bud Gregory stood up for the people he represented. Bud Gregory was there when he was needed. You could count on Bud. There is no question about it.

I hope the residents of Mississauga East will be looking at this situation, assessing the performance or lack of performance of their member, and also, again I want to reiterate, will themselves want to ask themselves their own member: "Where were

you when Bill 68 passed? Where were you when no-fault auto insurance was brought in by the Liberal government? What position did you take? You served on that committee. What did you do when you heard witness after witness after witness expressing concern, pointing out the shortcomings, looking at the fact that psychological injury was not going to pass the threshold, looking at the fact that 95% of innocent accident victims would not have the right to sue, to take an at-fault driver to court, looking at all the costs that are going to be absorbed by the taxpayers of this province with the establishment of another huge bureaucracy, looking at the windfall profits to the insurance industry, looking at the tax breaks and the millions and millions of dollars to the insurance industry, looking at the wasted millions that have gone through this government's insurance policies to the tune of \$14 million or \$15 million? Where was the member for Mississauga East when all this was occurring?"

I hope the voters and the residents of that riding are going to ask that gentleman that question. I hope they are going to ask him that question right now. I hope they are going to get on the phones to that member and say: "Look, this bill has not passed. They are still debating this bill. We want you to stand up and be counted. We elected you to represent us, not to simply echo Mr Peterson, the Premier of the province. We do not want you to be a sheeplike follower. We do not want you to be a rubber-stamper. We want you to stand up for the interests of the residents of Mississauga East. That is why we voted for you. We did not vote for you to go in there and rubber-stamp everything Mr Peterson says. No, not at all."

So call the member for Mississauga East at 965-9625. I am not lifting these cards up, because of my respect for the Speaker and the Speaker's views on this subject. I am encouraged to hold these cards up but I am not going to do it, because the Speaker offered his advice earlier in the day. He said I was not violating the standing orders but I want to indicate, despite the chastisement I am receiving in this House, that I followed the advice of the Speaker. I did not have to and he will acknowledge that. I did not have to, but I am trying to recognize his views and his respect for this place. I share that respect. I want to say that when I say I share the respect, it is as it involves the role of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. That respect apparently is not shared by the government, this Liberal government.

1630

Mr Speaker, when you look at what they have done with this time allocation legislation, when you look at their efforts to cut off debate in a meaningful way on no-fault auto insurance, they cut it off. They can argue, they can shout, they can scream, they can banter, but the reality is they are saying to us in the opposition, all 30-some of us versus 94 Liberals—there are 30-some opposition members—"Look, we are going to give you two days in committee of the whole," two lousy days in committee of the whole with—what?—30, 40, 50 amendments to discuss, and thousands of people who have concerns.

Mr Speaker, I have respect for this place, you have respect for this place; the Liberal government does not have any respect for this place or it would not bring in this kind of legislation.

Mr Cousens: Well said; well said. I do not think they are listening that well, though.

Mr Runciman: They do not know how to listen and that has been indicated clearly. They listen to what comes from the second-floor office. I do not want to attribute motives, but one has to wonder, in the face of the facts in respect to this legisla-

tion, about the fact that there are so many people hurt by this legislation and we have this sort of rubber-stamp mentality.

The failure of these people to speak up, to speak out, to express a concern bothers me deeply. It has bothered me deeply for some time. I have said this has perhaps affected me in an emotional way more so than any other issue I have dealt with in my nine-plus years in this Legislature. It really affects me that we hear these people in this House today chastising me, joking, criticizing me, making points of order to try to delay the process, trying to limit even further the amount of time we have to talk about this issue.

It is simply baffling to all of us on this side of the House why they will not be prepared to stand up. I have to even wonder if they spoke out in caucus. I do not want to attribute motives, but I have been on the government side for a period of time and I know there is that intimidation factor. I guess most of us are ambitious types or we would not be here, and we do not want to see those avenues of progress shut off because we simply spoke out on behalf of our constituents.

I think that is an attitude that has to go. That is an attitude that most Canadians are offended by. It is time we took stands. It is time we stood up on behalf of the people we represent and especially on an issue like this, when the government is doing something which is so patently wrong, so patently bad, so patently harmful to so many people in this province. If there is one issue the government should take a stand on, this is it. But it is not prepared to do it.

An hon member: Listen to the member for Lambton over there.

Mr Runciman: Yes, the member for Lambton is making interjections. I wonder whether he has any familiarity with this legislation or any understanding of it. Does he realize—and I want to reiterate this—that benefits are going to be slashed? Do the people in Lambton care, I wonder, that benefits are going to be slashed by 47.7%? That is what the government's actuary said. Benefits under this Liberal no-fault plan are going to be slashed by 47.7%.

Do the people in Lambton know that? I will bet they do not know that. I bet the member is not telling them that. He is just feeding them the government line, he and his sheeplike gang over there rubber-stamping this all the way through, despite the thousands of innocent accident victims it is going to hurt. Not one look sideways, not one look backwards; simply put the blinkers on and what the Premier says, that is it; forge ahead and hope that nobody notices; hope that nobody cares; hope that this slips right by the electorate.

I am telling you, Mr Speaker, it is very disturbing indeed. I have spent a significant amount of time talking about the Liberal lack of performance, the Liberal lack of concern, the Liberal lack of empathy and feeling for innocent accident victims and the thousands of people who are going to be hurt by this legislation. I am going move on to a few other subjects, because—

Mr D. W. Smith: It's about time.

Mr Runciman: Yes, it is about time, the member is right, but I guess the Liberal member is rather sensitive about me talking about the failure of the Liberal members to perform. I feel I have to do that in respect of the fact that we are being cut off, the way we are being restricted in our opportunities, and the fact that we have these arguments coming from the Minister of Financial Institutions that we have had all kinds of opportunity; it went through committee; we had meaningful hearings. Well, that is balderdash. We did not have meaningful hearings, we

had restricted hearings, very restricted hearings; hearings that the government was reluctant to participate in in the first place. It had to be forced into them by the opposition. We were restricted to four cities. We wanted to travel right around the province. We could not get the approval.

Then what did we have when we got to those committee hearings? An effort by the Liberal members of the committee simply to put the earplugs in, ask inane questions and get this thing through. "Get the old rubber stamp out, boys, and let's give it our blessing. We do not care what it is going to do to the people of this province. We do not care that it is patently bad. We do not care that it is harmful, that it is going to cost taxpayers millions and millions of dollars. We do not care. The Premier says this is what we have got to do. We like our jobs, so we are going to do what the leader of the Liberal Party tells us to do. We do not even care if our Liberal riding associations are upset; we do not care. In fact, we may even dump on them like the member for Sudbury did." He said, "Who the devil do they think they are, telling me what to do?" That is what the Liberal member for Sudbury said; not even listening to his own riding association.

We know the government House leader is facing some difficulties as well. The government House leader, the member for Hamilton Centre—they are all facing some difficulties with their own riding associations because of the stand, or lack of stand or failure to take a stand on no-fault auto insurance. The fact is that they are simply mouthing the government line; despite all the apparent flaws in the government line, that is all they know how to do. They are puppets on a string. The Premier and his friends in whatever industry—I will not get into who is going to benefit from this legislation, but we know who appeared before us and was strongly supportive of this legislation: the insurance industry, insurance brokers. That is it.

So we talk about puppets, we talk about the government House leader, we talk about all of the folks over there who are now starting to experience some problems with their own riding associations, their own Liberal rank and file, the grass roots of their own party, who are starting to be aware of what the impact of this legislation is. They are going to pay the price. Many, many members over there, perhaps, are going to pay the price.

I think there is a lot of wishful thinking over there, as I said: "We are going to get this through and nobody is going to know what this is all about. We could say, 'Look, the no-fault benefits are going up from \$149 to \$600 a week. Is that not great?' We will not say there is going to be a net reduction in benefits of 47.7%. We will not talk about that. We will talk about the small, little benefits that have been built into this. That is all we will talk about. Boys, that is what we concentrate on. Forget about all these cuts. Forget about this loss of benefits. Forget about the fact you are losing 50% of benefits. Forget about the fact that 95% of people will lose the right to take an at-fault driver to court. No, let's just talk about increasing the no-fault from \$140 to \$600 and increasing a number of other modest things."

Let's not talk about the windfall to the insurance industry of close to \$1 billion. Let's not talk about the tax breaks to the insurance industry totalling \$143 million. Let's not talk about the millions wasted up to this point by the Liberal government in its ad hoc, seat-of-the-pants crisis management of this insurance issue. Let's not talk about the millions wasted by the automobile insurance board. And let's not talk about the millions this is going to cost taxpayers by the establishment of a huge bureaucracy to administer this plan and the dispute resolution mechanism which could be, as I have said before, the son of rent review.

No one knows what it is going to cost. No one knows the bodies that are going to be involved in this. Rent review is costing us in the neighbourhood of \$40 million to \$50 million a year in this province, with a backlog of up to two years. The Minister of Housing is here. I believe my figures are reasonably correct: \$40 million to \$50 million. We are talking about drivers with a comparable system: dispute resolution. There are over six million drivers in this province and what is going to happen with dispute resolution? They do not have any idea how many accidents are going to go to dispute resolution. They do not know what it is going to cost us; not one clue.

1640

I asked the Deputy Minister of Financial Institutions in December: "What is the bureaucracy going to look like? What are the costs going to be?" They did not know. They were counting on this legislation being passed by 1 December, being in effect by 1 December, and here we were in the first week in December and the Deputy Minister of Financial Institutions did not know what this was going to cost, did not know how it was going to work, did not know how big the bureaucracy was going to be and what the implications were going to be on the civil service, let alone the taxpayers of this province. Pretty scary stuff.

But that is the way this government has handled auto insurance. They do not know where they are going. They have had no clear agenda. They have hopped from crisis to crisis. They have cost the taxpayers millions. They have cost the insurance industry millions and millions of dollars. They have done it all because they have failed to listen and act upon the advice, the expert witness testimony that they have heard going back to Bill 2 and the hearings of the standing committee on administration of justice which established the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board and, when you go on to this bill, establishing no-fault auto insurance. They have failed to listen. They have totally ignored the advice that has been offered to them.

Mr Speaker, I know you do not like me holding up signs, but I did have one other sign, which does not have a name on it, and I wanted to talk briefly about this. I hope you have no objections to this one, Mr Speaker. This is "Wasted taxpayers' dollars"—and this is just a modest amount. It says, "Wasted taxpayers' dollars, \$12-\$15 million." Twelve to fifteen million dollars of wasted taxpayers' money.

While I am talking about this, I want to talk about the priorities of this government. I want to talk about their failure to listen to people and their failure to act upon what they have heard. Twelve to fifteen million dollars, and that is just the beginning. That represents the money wasted, wasted by the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board.

That board was established in 1987. They established a significant bureaucracy up in North York with very plush quarters. You know this Liberal government; it does not worry about spending big bucks on lavish furniture. "Our people, our bureaucrats, are going to have only the best." They established these lavish quarters up in North York, appointed a long-time Liberal hack—is that the right word, Mr Speaker? Is that parliamentary?—a fellow by the name of Kruger who has held virtually every position in this Liberal government in five years, at a significant salary. I assume at least a top-scale deputy minister's salary. What is that—\$145,000 or something like that? With all the benefits, the perks, that go with it, probably a driver and a car; I am sure he gets a driver and a car. They established that and put them up in North York.

Mr Kerrio: You had a car and driver. What happened to your car and driver?

Mr Runciman: What happened to the car and driver for the member for Niagara Falls? That may be a more relevant question here today. I think ours is clearly understood. His we are still wondering about. We have never had a full explanation.

Mr Eakins: Yes or no—did you drive yourself?

Mr Runciman: Mr Speaker, they are diverting me from my message. I want to talk about wasted taxpayers' dollars. This is a very significant issue. I am talking about only one element of this, and that is the money wasted by the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board. This is an important ingredient of this as well. That board was established to set rates. It was the most massive intervention in the private sector in the history of this province. They got into the industry and they were going to set rates. They were also going to look at changing rate classifications. I want to say that points out how significantly they failed to heed advice. They were told by witness after witness after witness not to go ahead with rate reclassification because it would not work. It was going to see seniors, women drivers, the safest drivers in society, penalized with rate increases of 50% to 80%. But they did not heed that advice. They went ahead.

So in the spring of 1988 the insurance board was finished its work. It presented the new rates to the minister, and the new rate classification on which the rates were based, and there it was—80% to 90% increases for senior citizens and women drivers over 30; exactly what had been predicted at the hearings of the standing committee on administration of justice in the fall of 1987.

The minister would not pay heed to it; the Liberal government ignored it, and there the minister had the report from the automobile insurance board saying, "What they told you last fall was right; here is what it is going to cost consumers." The minister looked at it, took it to cabinet—the member for Niagara Falls may have been there at the time and he was chastised I might add because he at least said cabinet could overturn anything the automobile insurance board said. The Premier chastised him and said that was not the way it was going to be.

The minister took this document showing these significant increases to cabinet, cabinet panicked and said, "We cannot do this; it is political suicide." They threw it out the window. Months of work and millions of dollars down the toilet. I guess we can accept a mistake being made, but the problem with this one is the fact that they were told in the fall of 1987 by witness after witness after witness what was going to happen, and they totally ignored it. Millions of dollars out the window. Mr Kruger was humiliated—

Mr McLean: He pretty near quit.

Mr Runciman: He should have quit; he should have resigned, but I guess the gentleman knows no other life than the civil service; I am not sure. He stayed on. He said: "Kick me again. I am down; kick me again."

Mr Wiseman: He must be quite a Liberal.

Mr Runciman: I do not know; quite a Liberal. That says a lot about Liberals, I guess. So that is phase 1.

Phase 2: the minister then, in a panic situation, did not know what to do. He applied another rate freeze and he threw product reform back at the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board. He said: "Okay, I have thrown out what you have done

the first few months; I have thrown the millions of dollars you have spent down the toilet. We will give you something else to do: product reform. Take a look at two no-fault plans and take a look at something that is a choice plan between tort and no-fault."

So the board and all of the Liberal appointees on that board making their big per diems, and all of the staff making their thousands of bucks per day and per month and what have you, all went to work with their second assignment. But unbeknownst to the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board, the Minister of Financial Institutions and a few of his cronies in the bureaucracy and in the insurance industry were quietly working behind closed doors on another plan.

So what happens is that Mr Kruger and his Liberal friends worked on this hearing process, took a look at three plans and they came back again with a report to the minister which says what? What did it say? "We do not think no-fault is a good idea. We do not think that is the way to go. If no-fault is brought in, it is going to be brought in on the backs of innocent accident victims. The only way you can effect stabilized or reduced rates is through the reduction in benefits." That is what the insurance board said in its second report to the minister.

What did the minister do with that report that cost millions of dollars? I want to ask my colleagues what they think the minister did with that report.

Mr Cousens: He filed it.

Mr Runciman: You bet. He filed it again, and when he files those he at the same time pushes the crank on the toilet and down go millions and millions and millions of dollars again.

We are talking about just one element of this exercise involving the automobile insurance board, the establishment of that board, the plush offices, the fantastic salaries. They produced one report, against advice, and it was rejected. They looked at a second report, while the minister was doing his own little, quiet work behind closed doors; again, a total, flagrant waste of taxpayers' money. When I talk about \$12 million to \$15 million, that is what I am talking about.

1650

Mr Wiseman: How much money is that again?

Mr Runciman: It is \$12 million to \$15 million of taxpayers' money.

Mr Wiseman: Shame.

Mr Runciman: It is quite shameful.

Mr Cousens: That didn't include all the expenses and everything else, either.

Mr Runciman: No, it did not include all the expenses. I will have an opportunity as we proceed. It did not include the windfall for the insurance industry, but what was perhaps more important, the tax breaks for the insurance industry, the 3% sales tax on premiums which is being forgiven and the OHIP subrogation agreement which is being wiped out, which total in the neighbourhood of \$143 million, again coming from taxpayers' pockets.

Again, as I said earlier, it does not talk about what this bill itself is going to cost taxpayers on an ongoing basis. It does not talk about a host of things. It does not talk about the unbelievable waste of scarce resources at a time when we have people lining up at food banks in this most prosperous province in the country and this government is flushing millions of dollars down the toilet because it failed to listen to witnesses, it failed

to listen to the people of this province and it failed to listen to experts who knew and predicted what was going to happen. Up to this point it has cost us at least that \$15 million, not counting the agreement with the insurance industry and a host of other things.

How I am tying this into what we are talking about here today is, again, the government has refused to listen to witnesses. I want to talk about the cost element. We can talk about the rights and the benefits, but I want to talk about the element of cost and what some of the implications are here for taxpayers in the province in the future.

I have spoken briefly about dispute resolution and the fact that that could be another hornet's nest, a quagmire that we get ourselves into like we got into with rent control, where it is going to cost us unknown millions of dollars with no real handle on it and no way of putting a cap on it. It is a Pandora's box, and once we open it, there are some pretty scary prospects indeed in there for us as taxpayers.

I want to talk about one other element of this, and that is the fact—

The Speaker: The member for Simcoe West.

Mr McCague: Mr Speaker, there are not many members in the House to hear this very important contribution by the member for Leeds-Grenville. Therefore, I would like to move that we adjourn.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I really have to say, with respect, to the member, he does not have the floor. Therefore, I will recognize the member for Leeds-Grenville to continue.

Mr Runciman: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate that.

I was talking about the taxpayers' costs and I talked about what they have wasted up to this point and the fact that we have an unknown in respect to taxes with dispute resolution, but there is another one that is hanging over our heads. Again it could mean millions and millions of dollars, and again the liability is going to fall upon the taxpayers of this province. That is the constitutionality of this legislation.

There are legal opinions out there that this legislation will not stand up to a constitutional challenge, that it is discriminatory and violates the Charter of Rights. We have Gordon Henderson, QC, a former law partner of the Attorney General of the province, who has offered the advice that he feels this legislation may indeed be unconstitutional. We have a host of others who have expressed concern. We even have the insurance industry on the record expressing concern, asking for a referral to the Court of Appeal for a quick judgement in respect of the constitutionality of this legislation.

The government could do that and could deal with that rather quickly, but it has refused to do so. In fact, when I and others have questioned the Minister of Financial Institutions about this, he has talked about the fact that, "We have legal opinions"—the Liberal government has legal opinions—"and we feel comfortable."

The fact is that they have been unprepared to make those legal opinions public. That has to make one wonder, if indeed they are so certain that this legislation is constitutional, why they are not prepared to make those legal opinions public.

I want to say that the implications are serious indeed, very serious indeed. If we go down the road with this legislation, a year or two years from now we know we are going to have a challenge. We have had a number of groups indicate they are going to challenge the legislation.

If it is found to be unconstitutional, what is going to happen? We are going to find that in that one- or two-year period all those people, all those innocent accident victims who had the right to sue taken away from them by the Liberal government, are now going to have the right to return to the courts. The implications could be in the millions and millions, the hundreds of millions of dollars. Whom is that liability going to fall upon? It is going to fall upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of this province. That is the reality, simply because this government, for reasons known best to it, is refusing to refer this to the Court of Appeal for a judgement.

There are some sceptics who would suggest that the government's legal opinion indicates that indeed this legislation is fallible, that indeed it may not stand up to a challenge. All the government is prepared to do right now is get through an election, get the heat off, and if it is found unconstitutional after the election, well, so be it.

Then they will move to nationalize the industry. They do not care about the private sector; they will nationalize the industry. Instead of operating these thousands of brokerages across the province, with a little insurance broker in each small community, they will close them down and will sell auto insurance out of Ministry of Transportation offices. They do not care; they do not really care. All they care about is getting over this hump, the next provincial election.

I have said and many others have said that the implications of this are very significant to all of us as taxpayers. We could say this is going to come back to haunt them, but I do not want to see that happen. I do not want to be standing up in this Legislature, perhaps as a member of the opposition, and say, "See, we told you so," because that does not give me any solace, it does not give the taxpayers of this province any solace, because that money has been lost. It is like the \$12 million to \$15 million. We told them, witness after witness told them that it was wrong, that what they were doing was wrong, but they ignored them, they went ahead and they wasted that money—\$12 million to \$15 million.

That is a pretty paltry sum when you look at what the implications are if this legislation is found unconstitutional. As I said, we are talking about potentially hundreds of millions of dollars, so I do not want to be standing in this House and saying, "I told you so." I want to see the government act now; I want to see it refer it to the Court of Appeal and get a judgement. Let's play it safe. If this legislation is flawed, let's find out.

Why does the government not want to find out now? Why does it want to wait two years when it could cost us all hundreds of millions of dollars? Will anyone answer that question? Will any Liberal stand up in this House and say why the government will not do that? Why will it not refer this to the Court of Appeal and get a judgement so that we know that there are not going to be any negative implications for this province? No one up to this point has been prepared to do that.

Again, it is one of those things—you know, you tend to be cynical, but I am becoming increasingly cynical about this Liberal government, increasingly cynical about the motives and what it is attempting to do. This is so clear, when they just have to look at their own track record in respect to ignoring advice, in respect to ignoring testimony, in respect to wasting taxpayers' dollars, and they are still ready to forge ahead, still ready to ignore advice like that from Gordon Henderson, QC, and many, many other noted jurists.

1700

We have former Chief Justice Edson Haines—whose comments I want to put on the record later, because I am going to talk about this again—Justice Edson Haines, justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario, expressing very serious concerns about the constitutionality of this, and again it is not being heeded.

The thing that bothers me so much about this is that I have been involved in this as the insurance critic for four and a half years. I have gone through this with the government, the Liberal government, listening to what experts have told it, listening to the submissions, the documentation, and seeing it ignore it and then seeing it cost us.

Again, we are carrying on that same path, we are going down that same road, and there apparently is no desire on the part of the Liberal government to do anything about it, to pull back, to say: "Look, maybe we're not embarking on what is right for this province. Maybe there are some problems here in respect to the ability of this legislation to stand up to a constitutional challenge. Let's do the right thing. Let's do the responsible thing. Let's refer it to the court. We can have a judgement in a matter of weeks, before we give this legislation royal assent and bring it into law, and if there are problems, we have to go back to square one."

We can deal with the insurance companies through some other method over the interim, perhaps some sort of an interim rate increase to keep them solvent and keep operating in this province if indeed they are having financial problems this year. If that is the case, then it can be borne out by the statistical evidence presented to the government, providing them with some mechanism to carry on until it brings back amended legislation that can stand up to a challenge, that is going to recognize the very real concerns that are out there. But we do not see any desire, any willingness on the part of the government to take that kind of action.

I am going to move on to another gentleman who is very important in this day of debate.

Seeing that there does not appear to be any interest in the debate at this point, I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr Runciman moved the adjournment of the House.

1733

The House divided on Mr Runciman's motion, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes 16; nays 50.

Mr Runciman: I want to explain the motion in respect to the fact that we only had a handful of Liberals in the House to listen to one of the most important debates facing this province, and they do not care. That has been their record on auto insurance in this province, and that has been their record in respect to this bill; they do not care, they do not want to listen. They do not even want to listen to contributions of the members of the opposition although they are seriously limiting our opportunities to have input.

And even in that seriously limited opportunity that they are affording us, they do not want to even listen. They do not want to even be here and pay any attention. They are going to shove it to the innocent accident victims of this province and they do not want to even hear what we have to say. They do not want to hear those concerns. They do not want to hear the fact that the benefits to drivers across this province are going to be reduced. There is going to be a net reduction in benefits of 47.7%. I want to keep hammering that.

I had a couple of calls during the break from people who were not aware that the Liberal government, under its no-fault legislation, was going to reduce their benefits close to 50% and at the same time increase their rates. Figure that one out, folks. The Liberal members should explain that to their constituents, to the voters. They are going to reduce their benefits by close to 50% but they are not going to reduce their rates. What a deal.

That is one of the reasons the government wants to restrict debate. They do not want the people to understand. I want to say they are starting to understand. We are getting messages from Cochrane North, for example: "My member never told me about this. My member never said a word about such a significant reduction in benefits. He never said we're going to lose 47.7% of our benefits."

Who is the member for Cochrane North? The member for Cochrane North, Mr Speaker, believe it or not, is a Liberal and he is not telling the people in his riding that they are going to lose benefits to the total of 47.7%. The government actuaries say that. It cannot be disputed. It is a fact.

Also, a fact confirmed by the government actuaries is that 95% of the innocent accident victims in this province are going to lose the right to take an at-fault driver to court, 95% are going to lose that very basic right that we have all grown accustomed to and are entitled to. We are going to lose it because of the actions of this Liberal government.

I talked about the Liberal backbenchers not having any spine, not being prepared to stand up and be counted on, not being prepared to be heard on this legislation, not being prepared to talk for innocent accident victims, for the head-injured and for those suffering psychological injury who will have no access to the courts, no ability whatsoever to pierce the threshold, no right to sue if they have a psychological injury as a result of a car accident. They are going to lose that.

This lady from Cochrane North has a daughter who goes to Queen's University in Kingston, driving back and forth all the time. She is very concerned. She just watched this program today and for the first time she is starting to learn about some of the negative implications of this legislation. She is not hearing them from her Liberal member. He is another one who has failed to do his job, who is simply not standing up on behalf of the people of this province.

I want to take a few minutes to talk about the man who is responsible for this, the leader of the Ontario Liberal Party, Mr Peterson. What riding does he represent?

Mrs Marland: London Centre.

Mr Runciman: London Centre.

Mr Ballinger: The best Premier this province has ever had.

[Applause]

Mr Cousens: Three of them clapping and the rest of them—

Mr Runciman: I guess the rest have their hands tied behind their backs. We had three Liberals applauding when someone said, "The best Premier." I want to say it is a pretty sad day when we have those Liberal members prepared to stand here and shout on behalf of a man who is responsible for such negative, harmful legislation as this no-fault legislation, who is responsible for the actions of his government House leader, who is attempting to cut off debate by this opposition.

Her Majesty's loyal opposition is restricted to two days in committee of the whole. Most of the members of this opposition—both parties, New Democratic and Progressive Conserva-

tive—will not have the opportunity to speak out on behalf of the thousands of people across this province who are concerned because of the actions of this government. And who is ultimately responsible? Mr Peterson, the member for London Centre, the man they had the gall to applaud. Can you understand it, Mr Speaker?

The only reason they are doing it, the only reason they are standing up here in support of their leader, the only reason they are keeping their mouths shut in respect to this legislation is indeed that they are trained seals. They are trained yes-men and yes-women. They are sheeplike followers. They cannot stand up on their own. They cannot stand up on behalf of their constituents. They cannot stand up on behalf of innocent accident victims across this province. As I have said often before, they have a great deal to be ashamed of.

1740

Mr Mahoney: Cheap shots.

Mr Runciman: Who said that?

Mr Mahoney: I said it.

Mrs Marland: The member for Mississauga West.

Mr Runciman: There is a member who has only ambition on his mind. He has as much chance to get anywhere as a man with a wooden leg in a forest fire. That is the reality. But he still aspires to higher office. That is what this is all about—ambition, short-term political gain. No concern for the innocent accident victims across this province, none whatsoever. If he cared he would be standing up, he would be taking a look at the facts.

Mr Speaker, I have told you the basic facts are very clear. If you want a reiteration of them, I do not think we have to spell out more than two or three of them, and perhaps the most important one is the fact that there is going to be a net loss in benefits of 47.7%.

We will take this member who is standing here—I hate to use first names—the member for Oakville South. He has been paying close attention—

Mr Carrothers: I fell asleep. I'm sorry.

Mr Runciman: —or at least I thought he was. He has been in the House most of the day. He stands up here and says, "What are those losses?" I keep saying it, I keep saying it. I keep saying it, but I do not know what is required to get the message through to that member and to other members on the Liberal side of the House that this is bad legislation, it is harmful legislation, it hurts people. It hurts innocent accident victims, despite the mumblings and the rhetoric and the party line of the Minister for Financial Institutions. The reality is that this legislation hurts people. It especially hurts the people who can least afford it in society: the poor, the unemployed. Those are the people who are really getting it in the neck by this Liberal government.

You want to take a look at people who cannot afford collateral benefits, who cannot afford salary continuation plans, Mr Speaker. What is going to happen to them, the poorer people in society? They are going to be refused by these insurance companies because they present a higher risk to them, and they are shoved into Facility Association where they are going to pay two to three times the rate that they currently pay. That is the reality. We are seeing it happen now. We see Facility increased by close to 300% since this government has made such a mess of the insurance industry in the past two and a half years. The facts are out there. They are very clear if they want to look at

them, but they do not want to look at them. They do not want to pay any attention to the facts.

They have an agenda, and it is a political one and it is a short-term political one, to get them over the next election and that is all they care about. They do not care about those people who are not going to have the right to sue, who are not going to have the right to take an at-fault driver to court. They do not care, they simply do not care. Up to 97% of innocent accident victims will not have the right to take an at-fault driver to court when this no-fault legislation goes through. Remember that, ladies and gentlemen. Those are the facts. They are clearly presented in the government's own actuarial studies. We are seeing a significant reduction in benefits, along with that loss of right.

What is going to happen in Oakville South, whose member was here? What is going to happen? His constituents can look forward to an average 8% increase if they are lucky. They are going to get a close to 50% reduction in benefits, probably a complete loss of access to courts in taking an at-fault driver to court, and they are going to pay more for it. That's the facts. If the Liberals want facts, that's the facts. They just do not want to acknowledge it. Whenever the minister gets his opportunity we are going to have this baloney about improved benefits on the no-fault side and all of those little sorts of things. They are not going to deal with a reduction in benefits. They are not going to say, "Okay, the actuary says we're losing 47.3% of benefits and we're going to talk about that." They are not going to talk about that. They are going to ignore that. That is the strategy. "We modestly increase benefits on the no-fault side and a few other elements and then we are going to talk about that." The big lie, nothing less. That is all it is. "We get this party line and we push it. We do not talk about the negatives at all. We ignore them completely. They do not exist."

If you are a Liberal, Mr Speaker, close your eyes, plug your ears. You do not want to listen to the facts. You do not want to listen to the downside. You do not want to know how many people are going to be hurt. You just do not want to know. You do not want to hear. You do not want to listen. You do not want to react to those concerns. Just ignore them. "Move ahead with our short-term political agenda. Let's get elected. Let's have another majority government and then we will face the fallout. We will have four to five years to deal with it." Who is going to suffer as a result of that? I want to tell you, Mr Speaker, the people of this province are going to suffer, especially innocent accident victims.

Mr Speaker, as you can understand, appreciate and recognize, I get a little agitated about this issue. I do not want to pass out on the floor of the assembly. I have said often that this is an extremely serious issue and one that I feel quite strongly about. I quite sincerely hold feelings about what the government is doing and have genuine concerns about its long-term impact. Let alone its short-term impact on the people of this province.

The government members think this is a joke. Most of them are laughing at this. They do not care. We have backbenchers in here. The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, I guess it is, is in here parroting the government line. I think, like some others in this House, that is the only thing he knows how to do. They have to be followers. I suspect the only thing he has ever achieved on his own is dandruff. He is one of those sheeplike followers. They are not prepared to take a stand.

I know it takes a lot of intestinal fortitude to stand up to the leader of your party, but when that man is wrong, when that man is going to hurt innocent people in this province, innocent accident victims, is that not the time to put aside your own

aspirations, your own ambitions? Is that not the time to put that aside and say, "Look, I care about those people. I care what this legislation is going to do. I care about how it is going to hurt people, how it is going to damage people, how it is going to cost us, as taxpayers, millions and millions of dollars," and take a strong stand?

But again, it is not happening and we have Liberal members like the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, who spends hour upon hour in this House not making much of a contribution other than sitting over in a corner joking with a bunch of his cohorts about this legislation and its impact on witnesses.

This is an insult to people like Barbara Turnbull who appeared before the committee. She was shot in a convenience store holdup and came to our committee concerned about the future of innocent accident victims. You get this kind of contempt for testimony. That is what it is, contempt for people like Barbara Turnbull who cared enough and had no vested interest but who were very much concerned about future accident victims.

Jeremy Rempel, a young 18-year-old, who appeared before us in a wheelchair, was concerned about future accident victims and he wanted to be heard. He had no vested interest. He had nothing to gain, but he was concerned about what this no-fault legislation meant to innocent accident victims in the future. What is he getting?

We are getting a cutoff of debate, a stifling of debate in this House and, in the limited opportunity we have, we have contempt being shown by Liberal backbenchers for the debate. The opportunity for input is limited, and what do we get during that limited input opportunity? Contempt. Contempt from Liberal members of this Legislature. They ought to be ashamed.

1750

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr Runciman: I started to talk about the Premier of the province, the leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario.

Mr D. S. Cooke: That is what got you riled up.

Mr Runciman: That does get me riled up frequently. We talk about this bill hurting the little people in society, hurting the innocent accident victims, hurting a multitude of people in this province. I have talked about the lack of compassion and the lack of empathy for those kinds of people in society by the leader of the Liberal Party. I really believe that.

I knew the gentleman in opposition. I liked him. But when we see the actions of this government with respect to how it deals with the little people in society, especially through this kind of legislation, it has to make you step back and wonder why. Why does that particular leader not understand how this is going to hurt people? Why does he not appreciate how this is going to hurt people?

You have to say, well, perhaps it is because of a rather sheltered upbringing that gentleman has had. He has not really had to get out and put blisters on his hands. He has not had to worry. He has not had to worry about the next paycheque. He has not had to worry about making a mortgage payment. He was born into great wealth. I am not saying anything negative. These are facts.

This is a man who spent the early part of his adult life going to various schools. He went to a number of universities. He went to France and got an education. How many in this assembly, let alone across this province, had those kinds of privileges,

never having to worry about where the next cheque was coming from, whether you could put food on the table to feed your children, whether you could meet a mortgage payment or a rental payment? That particular gentleman never had those worries. He had a cushioned existence and I think we are seeing that in the way this gentleman, the member for London Centre, treats people in this province through the introduction of legislation like this no-fault legislation.

There is simply no empathy, no caring, no concern for the way it is going to hurt people, the way it is really going to hurt innocent accident victims in this province, the way it is really going to impact on the less fortunate in society—the unemployed, those people earning minimum wage or slightly above minimum wage, especially people in areas like Metropolitan Toronto where the cost of living is so high that even what in other areas of the province may be considered a reasonable income, is not such in Metropolitan Toronto. Those are the kinds of people who are going to be impacted and hurt so badly by this legislation.

The responsibility for this lies at the doorstep of the leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario. There is no doubt about it. He made a promise in 1987 during the heat of an election battle that got us in this mess. We are here today thanks to the Premier and a promise he made in September 1987. He said he had a very specific plan to lower automobile insurance rates. We know that never happened. We know that we have been in a chaotic situation ever since with respect to automobile insurance. We have had the government staggering from crisis to crisis without any clear idea of where it wanted to go, really in reaction to a very irresponsible promise made by the leader of the Liberal Party in 1987.

I have classified it as something other than an irresponsible promise. I have suggested words, Mr Speaker, that you and your colleagues have found not to be appropriate for Parliament, but I want to say that the message is out there for anyone who wants to look at it.

A promise was made in 1987. We know that insurance rates have risen over 20% over the interim since that election promise was made. We know now that what we are going to see through no-fault legislation is significant increases in all of the urban areas of this province and a stabilization, perhaps, of rates in some less populated areas. At what cost, though? At the cost of significant benefits, close to 50% loss of benefits.

I do not want to go on at much length about the Premier, but I want to say again that hopefully we in the opposition and others in the province who know what has occurred will ensure that during this next election, whenever it might be, it comes back to haunt him.

I know those of us who are trying to raise this issue in the House are hoping that perhaps the message will get through to him. Perhaps as he is jogging around his Rosedale mansion, he may reflect on the unfortunate way in which this is going to impact on the less fortunate in society.

I know when he is up in Rosedale, when he is out checking the blue boxes to see what his neighbours are drinking—I saw that comment in a recent article; that is one of the Premier's major concerns. When he is jogging around his Rosedale mansion, he is checking his neighbours' blue boxes to see what kind of wine they are drinking. He is concerned about what kind of wine he is drinking. But is he concerned about innocent accident victims in this province? Is he concerned about the less fortunate in society? Mr Speaker, I ask you.

No, what he is concerned about is: "I wonder what kind of wine my neighbour is drinking. I wonder what kind of French

wine he has." That is the sort of mindset, that is the sort of Premier that the people of this province are faced with. He is the kind of man who would introduce this kind of legislation that is going to hurt people right across this province.

I want to say that we can make our best efforts. There are 19 New Democrats and 17 Progressive Conservatives in this Legislature. We are faced with the largest majority in the history of the province of Ontario: 94 Liberals. Not one of the Liberal backbenchers is prepared to stand up and be counted.

Those of us who sat on that committee knew that the overwhelming majority of people appearing before us were very concerned about this legislation, opposed to this legislation, did not want to see it go through, wanted it changed, wanted it withdrawn. But nothing happened.

The committee members did not do anything. The members in this House are not prepared to do anything but cajole and heckle and insult witnesses who appeared before us. That is their agenda. That is what they are here for. That is all they are here for.

When the vote comes, we know they will be standing up, all 94 of them, hoping the Premier is personally looking at them as they stand up and say: "I am here with you, Mr Peterson. Look, I am voting with you, Mr Peterson." That is the way it is going to be.

The Speaker: Order. Once again, we refer to members by their riding.

Mr Runciman: I was referring to the member for London Centre, the Premier of the province, with 93 members of this House, and perhaps, most important, the members who are backbenchers because they are not tied by cabinet solidarity. We are talking about whatever number it is of backbenchers who are going to stand up as sheeplike followers, despite the knowledge that this legislation is harmful, despite the knowledge that this legislation hurts people, despite the fact that this legislation is going to cost the taxpayers of this province untold millions.

Despite that, they are going to stand up and hope that the member for London Centre, the Premier of this province, is going to say: "Yes, I recognize the member for Scarborough West. He did a good job. He stood up and voted. He followed my lead."

Mr Faubert: Ellesmere; Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr Runciman: The fact is, he did not do a good job, and those who follow the leader in standing up and voting for this legislation are not doing a good job. They are doing a disservice not only to their own constituents, not only to all the people they supposedly represent, but perhaps most important, they are doing a disservice, in my view, to what is most important, to the innocent accident victims of the future in this province, the people who are really going to suffer under this legislation.

We can talk about an awful lot of other people who are going to be hurt, and I have talked about the low-income people, the less fortunate. But the people who are really going to suffer, the people who are really going to hurt—as I said, this may come home to roost in members' own homes in the future—are innocent accident victims. They are the people the members should be concerned about.

They should not be concerned about standing up when the Premier stands up. They should not be concerned about future aspirations, about getting into cabinet or becoming a parliamentary assistant or getting a chauffeur-driven limousine or getting an open-ended expense account.

The government members should not be concerned about that sort of thing. They should be concerned about innocent accident victims. That is what they should be concerned about, but they are not. It is quite clear. We have not heard a word of concern, not one word from the Liberal ranks, nothing, nothing at all.

Interjections.

Mr Runciman: Now again we get these kinds of inane interjections, trying to be critical of me because I am trying, with the limited numbers we have in opposition, to voice the concerns of those thousands of people across Ontario who want to be heard, who simply want an opportunity to be heard. The government, through this time allocation motion, is not affording them that opportunity. They are pulling the rug out from under them. They are cutting them off at the knees. That is what they are doing. We have never had anything like this in the history of the Legislature.

The Speaker: Perhaps the member might glance at the clock.

On motion by Mr Runciman, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1800

ERRATA

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
28	1033	2	52	Beaulieu, who was killed while operating a crane on 5 June 1988.
28	1034	1	1	months, as it did in Mr Beaulieu's case? Is it not now time to

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaître, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrondola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reyecraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham
Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman
Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray
Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Monday 7 May 1990

Members' statements

Health services	1059
Mr Kormos	
Anniversary of liberation of the Netherlands	1059
Mr J. M. Johnson	
Anniversary of winery	1059
Mr Dietsch	
Youth employment	1059
Miss Martel	
Post-secondary education financing	1060
Mr Jackson	
Betty Smith	1060
Mr Ballinger	
Drug abuse	1060
Mr Hampton	
Accessibility for the disabled	1060
Mr Jackson	
Environment Day	1060
Mr J. B. Nixon	

Statement by the ministry

Trees Ontario	1062
Mrs McLeod	

Responses

Trees Ontario	1062
Mr Wildman	
Mrs Marland	

Oral questions

Elevators	1063
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Sorbara	
Agricultural land	1064
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Sweeney	
Drug abuse	1065
Mr Brandt	
Mrs Caplan	
Toronto waterfront	1066
Mr Cousens	
Mr Sweeney	
Automobile insurance	1067
Mr Kormos	
Mr Elston	
Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital	1068
Mr McLean	
Mrs Caplan	
Agricultural engineering service	1068
Mr Tatham	
Mr Ramsay	
Pollution control	1068
Mr D. S. Cooke	
Mr Peterson	

Capital funding for schools	1069
Mr Jackson	
Mr Conway	
Post-secondary education financing	1069
Mr M. C. Ray	
Mr Conway	
Court facilities	1070
Mr Kormos	
Mr Scott	
Announcements by ministries	1070
Mr Cureatz	
Mr Sweeney	
Nurses' participation in hospital management	1070
Mr Neumann	
Mrs Caplan	
Conservation authorities	1071
Mr Wildman	
Mrs McLeod	

Petitions

Automobile insurance	1072
Mr D. S. Cooke	
Diapers	1072
Mr Kormos	
Assistance to Chernobyl victims	1072
Mr Jackson	

Report by committee

Standing committee on estimates	1072
Mr McCague	
Tabled	1072

First reading

Harewood Park Association Act, 1990, Bill Pr67	1072
Mr MacDonald	
Agreed to	1072

Government motion

Time allocation, motion 30	1072
Mr Runciman	
Adjourned	1089

Other business

Committee business	1061
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Tabling of information	1071
Mr McLean	
Adjournment	1089
Errata	1089
Alphabetical list of members	1090

30 90



30 90

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 8 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 8 mai 1990



Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 8 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr Laughren: I normally do not raise matters that an individual constituent has with the Workers' Compensation Board, but I simply must today. Andy Petitcher of Gogama was awarded, by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Tribunal, a permanent disability pension for chronic pain in October 1988. The board, under what is known as section 86n, stayed or postponed the retroactive portion of that award. The decision still has not been made and his permanent disability award is really not permanent since it is renewed every 12 months.

He was told his award would be renewed in February, but it was not done until May. In the meantime, he has to call every month to get his cheques. His April cheque was two weeks late; his May cheque was over a week late. Just last week or so, he asked for his June cheque to be delivered to him three weeks early so he could visit his family in New Brunswick. Despite all those unconscionable delays on the part of the board, its response was to hit him over the head with its policy manual and say that it was not a matter of an emergency, nor a pressing need. That was their response.

The same board that will withhold money from Mr Petitcher at will at the same time will not let him take his June cheque three weeks early so he can visit his family. The compensation board is as mean-spirited and arrogant as it ever was, and in the words of the member for Dovercourt, if I could quote him, one time in a committee he said, "The board treats injured workers like dogs."

POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr Wiseman: Last week the Minister of the Environment announced the eventual banning of rigid foam insulation and flexible foam insulation used in furniture as evidence of his government's commitment to reducing ozone-destroying substances. Unfortunately, the commitment does not extend to emission control in used vehicles.

I have copies of the letters from the present Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Transportation to the member for Peterborough on this subject. Both ministers admit that, as things stand, the mechanic does not have to ensure that a pollution control system is present and functioning when a vehicle safety check is done. The Minister of the Environment even spoke of the "problems" caused by the lack of regulations and called it a "deficiency."

You might think that once this situation was pointed out to them, they would have done something to correct it. But no, these letters were written over a year ago and so far nothing has happened. It seems to me that a government that pretends to be so committed to a healthy environment that it concerns itself with the innards of furniture should devote itself to something far more basic, like the air we breathe all day every day on the streets and the highways of this province.

ELECTION IN CROATIA

Mr Faubert: As a member of a parliamentary observer team, along with the member for Mississauga East, the member for Mississauga West, the member for Halton North and the member for Durham East, I was privileged to witness the viability of the recent voting process in Croatia's first multiparty elections in 45 years, and so became a witness to history. We were joined by federal members as well as a team of US congressmen and lawyers.

My assignment was in Vukovar and its villages, east of Osijek, to report back to the Croatian Democratic Union, the HDZ, at whose invitation we were there, and to document observed polling irregularities, abuses and pressures.

First-round voting gave the HDZ 103 of the 131 decided seats, the Communists 13 and others 15. The latest reports from the second round of 6 and 7 May show similar results.

One appalling aspect of the election was the reaction of the international media, including Toronto's press, which appeared simply to echo the Communist-dominated national press line that the HDZ victory was that of the "rightists" with "ties to the Ustashe fascist movement of the Second World War." Nothing could be further from the truth.

Dr Franjo Tudjman, president of the HDZ, now President-elect of Croatia, fought against the Ustashes and was jailed for his national ideals. Having met and spoken with him, I know that he and his party want only to achieve national and human rights, peaceful democratization and a free economy to support the objectives of a viable Croatian state.

I call upon the Canadian government to establish a permanent consul in Zagreb to assist those many in Canada who wish to invest with their hearts in this future—

The Speaker: Thank you. The member's time has expired.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mrs Grier: Today, on behalf of the New Democrat caucus, the member for Hamilton West will introduce a private member's bill that has amendments to the Environmental Protection Act to authorize the making of regulations to reduce waste. Garbage is piling up all across this province, and the only way to really get at the problem is to reduce the production of garbage in the first place rather than find more landfill sites to put it in.

The bill's purpose is to implement a resolution that I put before this House last December and that was supported by members on all sides. The resolution listed policies and laws to reduce garbage through less packaging, more refillable containers and more durable consumer products. It called on the government to introduce the needed legislation at the opening of this sitting of the Legislature. We know that the government has completely failed to act to reduce garbage and so we have stepped in. We are providing the House today with a piece of legislation that does what all members of the House said they wanted to do when they supported my private member's resolution last December.

I ask the government members, since they have failed to act themselves, to delay no longer, to allow my bill to pass and to try to solve the garbage problem, which they have no answers to and to which we have some solutions.

ANNIVERSARY OF MOBILIZATION OF REGIMENT

Mr Villeneuve: This weekend an important date will be celebrated at the Denison Armoury in Downsview, as members of the Governor General's Horse Guards Association will meet to mark the 50th anniversary of the regiment's mobilization for war service in the Second World War.

The Governor General's Horse Guards of today are directly descended from one of Canada's oldest cavalry units, Button's Troop. In 1936, following a general reorganization of the militia, the Governor General's Horse Guards were formed. In October 1940 the regiment was mobilized, proceeding overseas a year later as part of the 5th Armoured Division. It saw action in Italy, Belgium and Holland, collecting numerous battle honours with the First Canadian Army before returning to Toronto in January 1946.

Today the Governor General's Horse Guards is a militia regiment, parading regularly at the Denison Armoury. It maintains its early traditions with cavalry through its riding club, in addition to militia training.

On behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus here in the Legislature of Ontario, I would like to congratulate the members of the horse guards on the occasion of their 50th anniversary reunion to be held at the Denison Armoury this weekend, 11, 12 and 13 May. Good luck to them.

1340

ELECTION IN CROATIA

Mr Sola: Imagine an election where thousands of people line up for hours to register for the right to vote. Envision an election where border crossings are jammed with columns, 10 to 15 kilometres long, of cars and buses loaded with citizens anxious to cast their ballot. Would you believe plane loads of voters landing at 15-minute intervals to exercise their franchise? How about a chartered private plane and a wild taxi ride in order to get to the polls on time? And all at the individual's expense?

Imagine an election where the opposition has little or no access to the media, yet draws crowds of up to 500,000 strong to its rallies. Unbelievable, yet true. This was Croatia on 22 April 1990, its first free, democratic, multiparty election in 45 years.

The people voted overwhelmingly against totalitarianism and dictatorship, of the proletariat or any other kind. Their clear choice was a party of moderate reformers, the Croatian Democratic Union led by Dr Franjo Tudjman, and its platform of democracy, self-determination, state sovereignty, religious, racial and ethnic tolerance, protection of human rights and a free market economy. It was a clear message that Croatians want to shed their status as second-class citizens and become equal in their own country.

As a member of a group of 11 Canadian parliamentary observers, including five from this House, I am proud to have been a witness to history in the land of my birth.

WOMEN'S HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Charlton: Over the last number of years we all have begun to pay lip service to the very important social problem that we have seen evolve around substance abuse. Unfortunately, we are not doing very much more in an effective, ongoing way than just paying lip service, and the priority we express in our words is certainly not there in our actions.

Mary Ellis Home in Hamilton is a women's detox centre and a recovery centre for recovering alcoholics. Mary Ellis Home is about to close because of lack of government support, both at the regional and provincial levels. The home may survive because of regional intervention, but this government has totally failed to respond.

Mary Ellis Home provides a service to recovering alcoholic women, most of whom are also sufferers of abuse, both physical and sexual. There are five men's centres in the city of Hamilton and two co-ed centres. If Mary Ellis Home closes, there will be two beds available for the treatment of women in Hamilton.

That is the reflection of this government's commitment to women, to substance abuse and to try to deal with a very serious social problem which has a much greater impact on women than it ever had or ever could have on men. The home should stay open.

NURSES' WEEK

Mr Eves: The second week in May has been declared Nurses' Week in order to increase the profile of the nursing profession and provide the public with an opportunity to show its appreciation to this dedicated group of professionals.

Today in Ontario there are over 80,000 nurses employed in hospitals, schools, retirement homes and other public and private institutions. These nurses provide care, both medical and emotional, to their patients. Their contribution to public health in Ontario is immense and their commitment is worthy of much praise.

During this week we should also reflect on the present crisis in our health care system, which is partly related to a nursing shortage in some areas of Ontario. A new commitment must be made to recognize the importance of the nursing profession in providing health care and adequate support must be given to those nursing organizations which provide home care in Ontario.

This week we salute nurses everywhere throughout the province. We recognize that a strong core of nurses is important for Ontario and we join with Ontarians from all walks of life in calling for action designed to strengthen the nursing profession throughout the province.

KATHLEEN TAYLOR

Mr Adams: It was my privilege to attend the ceremony at which one of my constituents, Kaye Taylor, received the Order of Ontario. This, in part, was the citation:

"Twenty-five years ago, when social programs were extended into native communities, Kathleen Taylor agreed to serve as the first relief officer for the Curve Lake Band. In her mid-40s, having raised eight children, she assumed responsibility for food rations and welfare cheques. This was an opportunity to fulfil her youthful desire to become a nurse, to care for and nurture her people. This purpose became the driving force in her life.

"During her first five years in the field, Kaye recognized the agenda of social programs as being irrelevant to the needs of native communities. Under her leadership, 15 bands met at Curve Lake to found the Ontario Native Welfare Administrators Association. Seventeen years later, it represents 101 of 106 bands in the province and Mrs Taylor, its first president, still serves voluntarily in that capacity.

"The association has become an advocate for natives and provides extensive counselling and assistance for a full spectrum of concerns from education and child care to family violence and aging.

"One of her greatest contributions has been to develop awareness of the importance of education among native people. The Ontario Native Welfare Administrators Association is only one example of Kathleen Taylor's work for which she received the Order of Ontario."

MEMBERS' PRIVILEGES

Ms Poole: Mr Speaker, I would like to raise a matter of privilege. Last week, a Conservative tabloid called the *Eglinton Sun* was distributed, without postage or labels, by legislative mail service to every member's box. I understand it even went further than this. I have a letter from legislative mail services which confirms that the request for this distribution came from the Progressive Conservative caucus office.

The rules of the Legislative Assembly are clear. The distribution of partisan material at taxpayers' expense is firmly prohibited. There is no question that this newsletter is partisan in nature. It not only features my Conservative opponent from the last election, but it also includes a Conservative membership form.

As I say, it abuses the privileges of this House and my privileges as a member. I would ask you, Mr Speaker, to review this matter and to determine how widespread the mailing at taxpayers' expense was and whether indeed this material was printed at taxpayers' expense.

The Speaker: I would first like to thank the member for informing me of her alleged point of privilege and sending me the material in advance of her submission.

I noted, by the submission she made to me previously and the comments made today, that she was asking for a ruling on whether the mailing of the tabloid was at taxpayers' expense and, if so, how widespread. I have to say that I really feel I have no authority to research how widely it was circulated but, for the information of the members, I am concerned about the mailing of the tabloid by a caucus staff member.

The guideline we have used is that any member may mail any items to all members in our post office without individual addresses but they must be requested by a member. Other individuals or organizations have been allowed to send items to all members, but they must be addressed individually.

Now I noted you have asked another question: Was this printed at taxpayers' expense? I have difficulty in taking it upon myself to research the printing costs so it really appears to me that it is an administrative problem and not a matter of privilege. I will, however, discuss this matter with the people in the post office.

1350

Mr McCague: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I have here a press release which says that the provincial government will continue to fund an after-hours hotline for tenants in Metropolitan Toronto. The announcement was made by the member for Eglinton. Would this be in order?

The Speaker: I do not believe it was really a point of order. It was certainly a question.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

CANCER TREATMENT

Hon Mrs Caplan: Mr Speaker, as I am sure you know, cancer is one of the specialty care areas which is given priority by the Ministry of Health. Today, I am pleased to announce that

my ministry has committed \$278 million for the largest expansion of cancer services ever undertaken in Ontario.

This funding will be directed towards the extension of cancer services in the Toronto area. This multi-year plan involves commitments of \$43 million to double the capacity to treat patients at the Toronto-Bayview Regional Cancer Centre, \$73 million for a new clinical services support wing at Sunnybrook Health Science Centre and \$162 million for three new regional cancer centres north, east and west of Toronto and for expansions at affiliated local hospitals to accommodate the centres.

These expansions, along with the rebuilding of Princess Margaret Hospital, represent a significant component of our government's \$300-million commitment to cancer services over the next four years, as the Treasurer announced in his budget.

As well, I am announcing a major change in the funding policy for regional cancer centres. Under the new policy the ministry will provide 100% of the cost of capital developments in the centres. Previously, two thirds of the cost had been provided by the ministry with the remainder coming through fund-raising.

These measures will enable us to handle current pressures caused by the dramatic increases in the number of cancer patients, as well as meet projected future demand.

The ministry funding to Toronto-Bayview Regional Cancer Centre will cover the total cost of doubling its physical size and resources to treat patients.

The centre will be adding seven radiotherapy machines, expanding chemotherapy facilities and enhancing diagnostic services and three-dimensional treatment planning. The additional radiotherapy machines will be in place by 1993, bringing to 13 the number at Toronto-Bayview.

The new clinical services support wing at Sunnybrook Health Science Centre will provide the increased support required for cancer patients as a result of the expansion at Toronto-Bayview centre.

My ministry will be contributing \$73 million towards the overall cost of surgical suites, intensive care units, laboratories and outpatient care clinics. The new wing will also serve cardiac and trauma patients.

The three new regional cancer centres will provide comprehensive cancer care services. These will include a total of 12 radiotherapy machines, multidisciplinary consultation and assessment programs, chemotherapy and day procedure capabilities.

Recruitment efforts are already well under way towards ensuring that there will be enough people to run these new machines when they become operational.

My ministry will provide the total \$102 million for the planning and construction of these centres. We will also contribute \$60 million towards capital projects at affiliated local hospitals to accommodate these centres. The local hospitals will provide inpatient and diagnostic services.

The change in funding policy means fund-raising for the regional cancer centres may now be directed towards Princess Margaret Hospital. The new Princess Margaret Hospital on University Avenue will be a state-of-the-art cancer research and treatment facility for the entire province.

These initiatives will greatly enhance the co-ordinated network of cancer services in the Toronto area and throughout the province.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Hon Mrs Wilson: I am pleased to announce today \$2.2 million in additional funding for the establishment of new emergency shelters and transition houses for assaulted women in Ontario. This funding will allow access to capital funding for new shelters available from the federal government's Project Haven. There are currently 81 shelters for assaulted women in Ontario. With these new funds we will be able to increase this number to at least 90.

Both I and my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services want to ensure that Ontario will stay a leader among provinces and territories in addressing the issue of wife assault. The new funding brings the province's 1990-91 financial commitment for wife assault initiatives to a total of \$43.2 million.

This new funding means there will be more safe havens for women who are in abusive relationships. Wife assault is a crime. There is never an excuse for it and it is never a private matter. Furthermore, the \$2.2 million in new funds is additional proof that this government means what it says, that we are committed to achieving safety and security for women.

PROPERTY TAX GRANTS

Hon Mr Mancini: It gives me pleasure to advise the honourable members that approximately 694,000 senior citizen households across Ontario will receive the spring portion of the 1990 property tax grant cheques over the next few days. The Ministry of Revenue started mailing the cheques, valued at a total of more than \$200 million, on 30 April.

The property tax grant is made available to offset municipal and school taxes paid by senior citizens who own or rent their homes and apartments. Tax benefits such as these reflect the Ontario government's concern for the wellbeing of our seniors. We help make it possible for them to remain in their own homes and continue to live very productive and fulfilling lives.

The maximum property tax grant interim payment per household is \$300, while the average amount per cheque is \$288. The grant is available in two instalments. The spring instalment is an automatic payment and the second instalment is made in the fall after the applications submitted by the seniors are processed. Because there are so many cheques, the mailing is staggered to allow for a continuous flow through Canada Post and to avoid delays in delivery.

I would like to thank the honourable members and their constituency office staff for their support of this program. It is very definitely a positive response by this government to a vital community need.

RESPONSES

PROPERTY TAX GRANTS

Mr Laughren: I wish to respond to the statement by the Minister of Revenue. He says that it gives him pleasure to announce that this miserable level of property tax grants is being mailed out. If giving out this level of grants gives him pleasure, I shudder to think of what other kinds of activities might give him pleasure as well.

Despite the fact that since 1974 the revenues from property and sales taxes have increased substantially, the revenues have increased three times as fast as the level of grants and they are sadly behind the level they were back in 1974.

On top of that, this government has done many things to make things more difficult for the property taxpayer. It has

reneged on its promise to pick up 60% of the cost of education at the local level; it has frozen unconditional grants at the municipal level; it has imposed court security costs on local municipalities that were not there before; it has imposed pay equity costs on local municipalities, and it has also imposed the employer health tax levy on municipalities.

If this minister and his government were really interested in doing something for the seniors at the municipal level, they would keep some of the promises they have made in the past.

1400

CANCER TREATMENT

Mr Reville: New Democrats welcome the expansion of cancer services, but we continue to be concerned that the government has not come to grips with either the causes of cancer or the quality of life experienced by those who receive cancer treatment.

Carcinogens in our workplaces, our air, our water and our soil can indeed be reduced. Smoking can be reduced. Lifestyles can be improved. We can develop empowering processes so that people make wise lifestyle choices, but much more remains to be done about poverty before such choices can indeed be real.

It is a paradox that our health care system and the technological advances that go with it can preserve life without reference to its quality. The government's failure to deal with issues of home care, palliative care and income that the people suffering from cancer experience and enjoy are serious problems.

Experts in oncology tell us that a strong local support system is very valuable to people who are receiving cancer treatment and, of course, the government's approach to regional care undercuts the local support that would be very positive for people.

I think the government has addressed only one of three problems.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr R. F. Johnston: Is it not wonderful what an election will do? For five years this government has refused to add any new centres for assaulted women in this province. It has added a few beds here or there, but the promise now of having at least 90 in place—God knows when; it does not say—is the first new initiative by a government which has refused to add any new spaces in the last number of years.

Is it not ironic that the only reason the Liberals are doing it, besides the election, is that the Mulroney government is actually bringing forward some money they can piggyback on so that they can spread their money a little bit further? God knows, these are nine new centres over a six-year period, when we know how large that problem is out there. We know just how positive the Mulroney government has been towards women's issues. We have seen some evidence of that again lately.

It is a real shame, it seems to me, and a major statement of where this government stands on women's issues, that the only time it could add new centres for assaulted women is in the wake of the federal government, which has been so niggardly in its response to women's issues, whether it is to do with day care centres or assistance for assaulted women and organizations for women in this country. Only now is it able to come forward with nine centres in this province, when we know just how extraordinary the need is.

They should all be ashamed of themselves for coming forward with this at this very late date, given that the Premier in

1985 made commitments to new centres and he is only now fulfilling that promise six years later.

PROPERTY TAX GRANTS

Mr Brandt: Under normal circumstances, the announcement by the Minister of Revenue would be welcomed by the members of the Legislative Assembly, because it does in fact assist the seniors in our province by reducing the amount of taxes they pay through the property tax relief program that is part of the responsibility of the Minister of Revenue.

What concerns me is the very point that was raised by my colleague from the New Democratic Party, and that is that this grant becomes less meaningful and has less impact as property taxes increase at the local level. While the government and this Treasurer continue to shift both educational taxes and property taxes on to the local taxpayer, it makes the burden of seniors living in their own homes much more difficult, because this is a flat-rate relief program: \$300 is the maximum and \$288 is approximately the average that our 700,000 seniors across the province receive for this particular assistance.

But I want to tell members that with each passing year as the government offloads, shifts, passes on responsibilities and takes the easy way out by way of asking someone else to pay the bills, it hurts the very seniors that this program was supposed to help, and it is wrong.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr Jackson: I would like to respond to the announcement by the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues, partially because it is a very brief announcement today. It certainly does not have many of the details. If we were being completely open and honest about this announcement today, we would have to indicate the amount of money that is coming from the federal government in order to make this a reality and we would have to admit how much is missing from the 1990 Ontario budget with respect to women's issues, in particular this important issue of family violence.

If the minister herself would look into the facts, she would know that in the last two years this province lost federal grant money because the province refused to take up the moneys that other provinces—

Mr Callahan: Baloney.

Mr Jackson: The province of Manitoba under NDP and Conservative governments used Ontario dollars to build shelters for abused women. The Conservative government in Saskatchewan used additional moneys that were earmarked for Ontario because this government said, "We're only going to expand one or two shelters over a five-year period."

Eight thousand to 10,000 women and children a year are turned away at shelters for lack of space, for lack of programs. One third of the 60 homicides in the city of Toronto in the past year were directly linked to domestic violence. That is what is going on out there, I tell the minister.

This announcement is six years late and those beds are required. We are going to have to use federal government funding; it certainly is not major dollars from this government's budget. But it is sad that it takes an election call to get this government to make a meaningful commitment to battered women in this province.

CANCER TREATMENT

Mr Eves: I would like to briefly address the statement made by the Minister of Health in the House this afternoon.

Over a year ago, several people in this Legislature told the minister that these radiotherapy machines would be coming on stream and that we needed radiotherapy technologists in the province in the worst way. The minister's response is, over a year later, to say that recruitment efforts are well under way. They should have been well under way for the last three, four or five years.

Did people have to suffer for the last year until the minister waited until she thought it might be convenient, during an election year? Is that why people have to travel to Thunder Bay and other jurisdictions, like Mrs Brander from my constituency, until the minister thinks it is politically opportunistic for her to stand up in the House and respond?

Where was the minister a year ago when we asked these questions in the House? What has she been doing for the past year? What about the cancer treatment centre in Sudbury? The minister commits dollars to bricks and mortar; she will not do anything about getting Dr Ho and other qualified people in to act as oncologists in those centres.

I would remind the people of Ontario that when the budget was announced on 24 April, Treasury officials in the lockup indicated that only \$30 million of this money will be spent during this fiscal year. I also want to remind the people of Ontario this is the same government that said it had increased the number of beds in the province by 4,400 in 1987 and since then has reduced the number of beds by 2,000.

1410

ORAL QUESTIONS

AGRICULTURAL LAND

Mr B. Rae: I have some questions today for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Back in 1988, a researcher from the New Democratic Party asked the government when the policy statement on food land preservation, which was issued in 1986 under the signature of the Minister of Agriculture and Food and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, would be before cabinet. The answer was that it would be early fall in 1988 or, optimistically, late spring.

We are now in the year 1990 and we still have no clear statement from this government with respect to its policy on the preservation of agricultural land and the limitation on urban growth and the impact that that growth and development is having on prime agricultural land in the province. I want to ask the minister, what has happened to these guidelines and when are we going to have them clearly stated in the Planning Act?

Hon Mr Sweeney: The Ministry of Agriculture and Food brought forward a draft set of guidelines. At the same time, it was the decision of cabinet to look at a whole series of planning changes involving the Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Agriculture and Food and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. One of the reasons the Premier set up the new cabinet committee on housing and community development was to bring those four ministries together to find a range of consistency with four different sets of guidelines. That process is taking place at the present time.

Mr B. Rae: We all thought Project X was dead, but it is obvious that it has raised its head again. We went through the period of the 1970s when this issue was very much a live one. The Conservatives brought forward a food land guideline in 1978 that set out certain policies with regard to the protection of agricultural land. Since that time the amount of agricultural land in the province has declined dramatically and the rate of

conversion from agricultural land to development has expanded considerably. Indeed, there has been an epidemic since 1976.

I want to ask the minister this question: Can he tell us why, for example, changes that would require designations that allow strip development into agricultural areas to be avoided, that urban growth take place as a logical extension of existing development, that development of existing vacant lands within urban areas occur before outward expansion on to prime agricultural land, and on and on and on—basic principles of planning—have not been put in place well before the epidemic of development took place?

Hon Mr Sweeney: My honourable colleague will be well aware of the fact that the announcements we have made recently with respect to new development, both within our housing policy and within the use of provincial land, have referred to those very issues. As a matter of fact, the most recent announcement I made with respect to Seaton talked about those very initiatives as well; we want much denser development on a smaller amount of land, so that in fact more green space and more agricultural land can be protected for the future. There is no quarrel with respect to those particular initiatives. We are working on them at the present time. As I indicated to him, the current Minister of Agriculture and Food concurs with all of these and his new land use plans will certainly reflect those.

Mr B. Rae: I am very familiar with how strongly the Minister of Agriculture and Food feels about a number of issues, but my question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs is simply this: He well knows that the Planning Act is in place and that under the Planning Act and the designations that are contained under official plans, decisions are being made every day in the regions of this province, in York region, in Niagara region, in Peel region, in Halton region, all throughout southern Ontario. These decisions are being made by planners under the current law. When is the law going to be changed so that agricultural land is protected? When is it going to happen?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I have had numerous discussions, as I am sure the honourable member would appreciate, with my colleague in Agriculture and Food. We share a concern with the use of agricultural land. We have made a joint determination that we want more compact use of existing urban land. The housing policy on land use that has been distributed across the province since last August clearly identifies that as one of the goals and clearly indicates that the provincial policy statements and the umbrella provincial policy statement, which are in the works right now and which I would clearly hope to have available in the fall of this year, are going to reflect all those initiatives and all those policy positions.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE DISABLED

Mrs Grier: My question is for the Minister of Housing. Earlier today Trans-Action, which is a coalition of organizations of disabled persons, released a proposal that there is to be a revision to the Ontario Building Code, which falls within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Housing. That revision would be to exempt rapid transit stations from the provision of the building code that requires elevators to be installed in multistorey structures. If in fact such an exemption is given, that would set back the cause of accessibility to transit systems for the disabled by decades and would be a reneging on promises that this government has made on countless occasions. Can the Minister of Housing assure the House that no such exemption is contemplated?

Hon Mr Sweeney: On a periodic basis the regulations with respect to the building code are reviewed. That is a process that is under way right at the present time. The review process was divided up into five sections. The honourable member will be aware of the fact, I am sure, that under the existing building code and its regulations there is no reference at all to rapid transit stations. I am not quite sure why that is the case, but that in fact happens to be the case. When this review was contemplated it was obvious, given the amount of activity that is going to be taking place over the next decade, that in fact we ought to have a section within the building code dealing with rapid transit stations.

She will be aware of the fact that the Minister of Transportation has made it very clear that the policy intent of the government is to make these accessible to the physically disabled. The only difficulty we have at the moment is that we do not have the technical knowledge and the technical expertise to have people, in exiting from a rapid transit station, exit from the car if it has to stop anywhere between stations. Until we have that technical knowledge, we had suggested as part of the process that exemptions would be made. That does not prohibit them from—

The Speaker: Thank you. Order.

Mrs Grier: At the press conference this morning, representatives of the disabled eloquently spoke of their right to take risks. They pointed out that all of us take risks when we move around at all in society. They acknowledged that perhaps there was a risk in using rapid transit, but that they felt they ought to be the ones to decide whether or not they took that risk.

The minister says the Minister of Transportation has given a commitment that there will be accessibility in rapid transit. I point out to him that when I raised this with the minister, what I was told was that there would be provision for accessibility. Provision for accessibility means creating the shaft but not putting the elevator into it. Is that the kind of provision this minister is prepared to contemplate? There is no requirement to amend the building code to make the new rapid transit systems accessible. Why is the minister even discussing—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon Mr Sweeney: The honourable member is correct that the Minister of Transportation has indicated that at the present time, given the current technical knowledge and expertise we have, he certainly wants any subway station that is being retrofitted or any subway station that is being built for the first time to have all the necessary provisions built in at that stage. As soon as we have the ability to deal with the other risk factors—I accept the honourable member's statement that we all take risks, but I believe she would also accept the fact that we have an obligation, particularly for a disabled person, to reduce the risk as much as possible.

I would also point out that at this point in time the regulatory proposals are at the consultation stage. During the months of April and May we are consulting with a large number of groups and getting the kinds of feedback she is mentioning to us. We will be making a decision somewhat later on as to how much farther we proceed. We want to be sure that we can, not eliminate the risk but at least reduce it as much as possible and still provide accessibility in the way the disabled community wants us to do it.

Mr Allen: Our information is that there has not been consultation. It is a rather strange procedure for the minister to be so paternalistic with respect to people who are prepared at least

to accept an element of risk and who have pleaded with this government for years to move on the question of accessibility for public transit systems on the part of the disabled. They have pressed for memorandums of agreement and they have had no response whatsoever. They have asked for public transit accessibility before parallel systems in their document *The Freedom to Move is Life Itself*. Consistently, they have asked for the acceptance on their part of the recognition of an element of risk.

Why is the minister moving in what would appear to be a regressive way at this point in time with regard to the whole movement towards accessibility by entrenching in the building code a provision that reduces rather than expands accessibility?

1420

Hon Mr Sweeney: I would repeat for my honourable colleague that in fact we are putting into the building code, for the first time, the whole question of accessibility to subway and rapid transit stations. That is a very clear indication that we too share the desire of the disabled community to have that kind of accessibility.

I would disagree with him. The fact is that we recognize some potential risks and we want, to the extent possible, to reduce those risks. I do not think we can completely eliminate them—as the member's colleague indicated, we all take those risks—but want to reduce them as far as possible so that when the infrastructure is in place, the disabled community will be as safe as the rest of us will.

I think they have a right to know that while they have access to it the same as the rest of us, they also ought to have a right to expect the same kind of safety features that the rest of us would expect to find. We are quite prepared to do that. The pre-fit to be sure that all of that can happen in renovated stations and in newly built stations is something that we agree with and the consultation process will determine how—

The Speaker: Thank you. New question, the member for Sarnia.

[Applause]

Mr Brandt: I have a question for the Treasurer, but I will wait until the applause dies down.

Mr Breaght: It died about three years ago, Andy.

Mr Brandt: At least I did not physically die two years ago, or politically for that matter.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Mr Brandt: The Treasurer in his budget projections indicated that he anticipated there would be some 81,000 housing starts. At the time I looked at that figure I had the queasy feeling deep within myself that perhaps he was being just a modest degree overoptimistic about his projections. We now have the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp report that has come out indicating a projection fully 35% lower than that estimated by the Treasurer. In fact, they estimate that there will only be some 52,000 housing starts, which is considerably fewer than what the Treasurer has suggested. Could the Treasurer indicate to this House whether he is prepared to revise his budget to a more realistic figure?

Hon R. F. Nixon: The Treasury has given the House its recommendations for economic projections. Going back into December, the honourable member will recall that the grey book was published at that time. Those were moderated to some extent for the preparation of the budget and we feel our recom-

mendations are reasonable. The count of the houses and the level of activity are taken on a somewhat different basis. We still think there will be about 80,000 starts in Ontario this year. Most of the reduction in the activity is in the Toronto area, which of course has been the centre of the fastest housing boom in the history of the nation. This has levelled off substantially, as the honourable member has indicated.

Mr Brandt: The Treasurer is aware that not only are his projections on the high side compared to others who are bringing in their suggestions as to the numbers that will in fact be constructed, but that the number of starts is declining more rapidly in Ontario, based on the latest statistical reports, than anywhere else in the entire country.

As a result of this slowdown in economic activity—the layoffs in the housing industry, in the auto industry and the very critical layoffs that we have in northern Ontario related to the mining and the lumber industries—is the Treasurer prepared, at some reasonable period of time in the future, to bring in a revised document that will more truly reflect conditions in Ontario, rather than just trying to put forward a balanced budget document that is not realistic in light of these economic facts?

Hon R. F. Nixon: We think the fiscal projections are realistic. We were very careful not to base them on the projections of Mr Wilson, the Minister of Finance for Canada, in his budget, which is less than two months old, when he indicated that interest rates would go down to an average of 11.1%. Since he made that projection, the interest rates have done nothing but go up. We are hoping he does not have to make a different projection because certainly those have a tremendous impact on the economy in general.

Let me assure the honourable member that I have no proprietary or vested interest in the projections that come from the economists of the Treasury. They do the best they can, and when they give me new projections I will be very glad to table them in the House and make them available to the honourable members and the people of the province. They are, like all economists, looking into the future and doing the best they can. They are among the best trained and the best experienced, and I have great confidence in their intellectual veracity.

Mr Brandt: Those intellectuals in the Treasury were in great part trained by a previous government, I believe. I therefore would not want to question the accuracy of some of their reports, but I believe the Treasurer is being somewhat too modest about his input into this particular document.

When the Treasurer recognizes that housing starts relate to jobs, the viability of the auto industry relates to jobs and the activity in the north relates to jobs, and when he looks in his budget as to the actual projections he has brought forward, in virtually every instance—job creation, housing starts and the overall growth in the economy—it appears this Treasurer stands alone with respect to his rather singular optimism regarding the economy. When is he prepared to face up to the facts that there is a slowdown taking place and that his projections are all on the high side?

Hon R. F. Nixon: I sense the honourable leader of the third party is the only person in the province who might take some pleasure in the unlikely event that my projections are optimistic, but they are based on the best information available.

Actually, I was not aware that these economists had been trained by himself and his collection of former ministers. If I had known that, perhaps I would have asked for other advice. My own experience, frankly, is that they are independent of me in that respect, just as they were independent of the honourable

member. Maybe he thought he was directing them, but in fact it is their responsibility to base their recommendations on things other than political influence. That is probably why they are better now than they were then.

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Brandt: As one of the last questions I will have an opportunity to ask as leader of this party—

The Speaker: To which minister?

Interjections.

Mr Brandt: I did not realize I was going to get such an outburst of support on the other side.

The Speaker: And to which minister?

Mr Brandt: To the Minister of Community and Social Services, with whom I have had dialogue on this question for some time. I want to highlight, as one of my last questions in this capacity, what is in my opinion one of the most important issues that is not being dealt with by this House, and that is the whole question of children's mental health services. I have pointed out in the past that some 10,000 children in Ontario are waiting for treatment. The minister knows that even today press reports have indicated that in his own area, the York region abuse program is running out of money to treat all the children who need care in that particular part of our province.

Can the minister explain, given all of the evidence before him, why the treatment programs for these children are not a higher priority of his government?

Hon Mr Beer: I want to say to the honourable member that I share completely his concern about this area, and indeed I believe it is a high priority. We are demonstrating that by a number of the things we are and have been doing. Let me just remind the honourable member of a couple of them. With respect to the waiting list and with respect to a number of the funding issues facing the children's mental health centres, as I have said before, I met with the executive of the association and from that meeting we made a commitment to do a number of things.

For example, we have brought on an individual who is working full-time with the children's mental health centres on the waiting list and on the various services that are available within the community that can help the children's mental health centres in dealing with a number of the children on the list. We have moved to provide more funding this year for the staff of the children's mental health centres and we have increased the base budgets.

In addition, the Colin Maloney report, which will be out next month, looking at the whole field of children's services, is going to guide us in working with the children's mental health centres to make sure that not only are they properly funded but that the whole area is properly organized and funded and that is a priority.

1430

Mr Brandt: I want to point out to the minister that it is not only children's mental health centres that have a crisis at the moment, but in fact children's aid societies, which are the first line of defence for abused children; they are also in crisis.

The executive director of the Children's Aid Society of Ottawa-Carleton claims "children remain too long in abusive homes because of a lack of provincial funding for children's aid societies." Yet the member for Ottawa-Rideau, who is the

minister's parliamentary assistant, stated in the debate on my resolution dealing with this crisis in children's services that the children's aid society has the resources to provide counselling to children and has the ability to apprehend them.

Can the minister explain why some nine out of 87 cases in the Ottawa-Carleton area under the jurisdiction of the children's aid society were classified as instances where the children were being abused? Fully 10% of all of the cases they checked out had home situations that were simply not tolerable. How can that be allowed to happen in Ontario?

Hon Mr Beer: I have said to the honourable member, we are aware of a number of complex problems that are facing the children's services sector. Again, therefore, I want to underline the importance of the Colin Maloney report.

With respect to the children's aid societies specifically, there are a number of things that we are doing with them, looking at the whole question of their budgets, looking at the case load problems that they have, looking at how the whole area in terms of the family counselling associations, children's aid societies, children's mental health centres can work better together to maximize the funding that is available.

Finally, and specifically related to the question of child abuse and how we are able to handle that question, as the members know, I have asked Ms Joanne Campbell to review all of our procedures with respect to that area and she will be coming in with recommendations. I am sure that in the course of her review she is going to be looking specifically at some of the problems that are facing children's aid societies across the province. It is a priority issue and we are moving on it, but we are—

The Speaker: Order. Final supplementary.

Mr Brandt: If 10,000 children somewhere in the world who were being physically and mentally abused were gathered in one spot, the world community would find some way to respond to their needs. The situation that we have here is 10,000 children scattered in fives, in tens, in dozens and in hundreds throughout various communities across this province, some 10,000 of them, and that figure is quite accurate, as the minister knows, having been developed by those professionals who are working in the field.

Will the minister undertake one commitment that I would ask him to do? Will he take some of the case examples which I know he has in his possession, which have been passed on to him, some specific examples, and will he discuss these with his cabinet colleagues and attempt to get some response from his cabinet colleagues to the effect that they are prepared to accelerate the assistance programs so that we can start to reduce those numbers on this critical waiting list? Is the minister prepared to do that?

Hon Mr Beer: I think that not only have we made that commitment in terms of improving the services, but we have shown that in real terms already this year with the steps we have taken to improve the funding of the children's mental health centres and to improve the salaries of those working in that area.

Again, I would remind the honourable member that my budget has gone up some \$800 million over last year in terms of dealing with a wide range of issues, of which those facing the children's sector are among the most important and the ones on which we place a very high priority. All of this, again, we are doing at a time when the funding from the federal level is not what it was and indeed is going to be less. So I believe that commitment is there.

I can say to the honourable member this is an issue in which not a week goes by when we are not trying to find some way of sending more funding into this area and dealing with the specific kinds of cases he has mentioned. I believe we are making progress, and once we have the Maloney report we will have a set of guidelines, a blueprint, for working with those in the field to make sure that we get rid of that waiting list.

CORPORATE TAX

Mr Laughren: I have a question for the Treasurer concerning Ontario's truly awful tax system. The Treasurer should know that in 1988 the fifth largest profitable developer in Canada, Hammerson Canada Inc, had an operating income of \$35.2 million, distributed dividends of \$14 million to shareholders and paid no income tax whatsoever, and E-L Financial Corp, the fifth most profitable property and casualty insurer in Canada, had an operating income of \$27.9 million, distributed dividends of \$6.4 million and actually got a \$1.3-million tax credit from the long-suffering taxpayers.

I think the Treasurer understands that what is happening with his wealthy friends is that, first of all, the corporations are paying no taxes because of writing down their operating income; then the wealthy shareholders are getting a tax credit on the dividends they receive because the corporations, it was assumed, would be paying taxes and there was not supposed to be double taxation.

Given the fact that so many of these wealthy corporations are paying no taxes, how does the Treasurer justify not bringing in a minimum corporate tax this year?

Hon R. F. Nixon: The honourable member knows that our capital tax serves that purpose to some degree in this province. Other provinces have followed our lead in that connection, although the province of Quebec, for example, has a larger capital tax than we have.

Mr Laughren: I guess the Treasurer is telling us that the capital tax—what is it; 0.3% or 0.03%?

Hon R. F. Nixon: A lot of them think it is too high.

Mr Laughren: Yes, of course, they think it is too high.

The Speaker: Question?

Mr Laughren: Not only has the Treasurer turned a blind eye to that, but this year he put new money into the current cost allowance of \$140 million to these same companies, which is exactly the same kind of tax credit we are talking about.

Could the Treasurer tell us how he justifies those kinds of tax expenditures to the wealthiest corporations in Canada? At the same time, he is saying to the people at the minimum wage of \$5 an hour that they have to pay \$360 to him in the way of provincial income taxes at the end of the year. How does he justify that?

Hon R. F. Nixon: I have been able to glance at my book here and the capital tax return is about \$650 million this year. The honourable member would also be aware that the announcement of the doubling of the current cost allowance is designed to make this jurisdiction attractive for the investment of funds in production machinery and other capital which is designed to make our economy strong, continue strong and provide jobs. This of course is the answer to why some corporations do not pay taxes. It is because they respond to the requirements of the governments of Canada and Ontario to commit their resources to the expansion of their ability to manufacture and create jobs.

We feel that is the kind of leadership we need. I have a feeling that the knee-jerk socialist responses of the honourable member would simply destroy the economy here and we can thank our lucky stars that they have nothing to do with it.

Mr Jackson: It is interesting to hear an armchair socialist call a knee-jerk socialist by name.

MINISTRY MAILING

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues. Last Friday, women's groups all across Ontario received a very interesting piece of literature from the government; in fact, from the Ontario women's directorate. It was sent by courier. When they got these envelopes and opened them, they found they were empty. I would like to ask the minister responsible for the directorate and women's issues just when she was advised of this incident and if she can advise the members of the House just at what cost this incident came to her ministry.

1440

Hon Mrs Wilson: I thank the member opposite for the advice of this incident. I will immediately check into it and determine if, in fact, it did take place and, if so, why.

Mr Jackson: We have established that it did take place. I am surprised that the minister has not received any phone calls. She prides herself on her ability to get out and meet women's groups. But in fact when these groups called the Ontario women's directorate and said, "What was supposed to be in this envelope?" they were informed that the entire mailing went out empty. Since this was on a computerized mailing list, one can only assume that it was a rather extensive mailing.

I would like the minister, if she will, to report to the members of this House just exactly what the cost of this empty mailing was, and then to be advised, on behalf of all members of this House, that if she is going to be in such a rush to mail out election material from her ministry, does she not think she should wait a little bit until she has something to put into it?

Hon Mrs Wilson: I have committed to the member that I will look into this incident to determine in fact that it took place and to determine why. I am sorry that he may have been inconvenienced in opening an extra envelope and I will certainly determine what the facts behind that are.

INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO

Ms Oddie Munro: My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. In his remarks to shareholders at Stelco's 80th annual meeting, John Allan, chairman of Stelco Inc, expressed his concerns regarding the tendency of governments to look to the service sector rather than the manufacturing sector as the main engine of economic growth. Mr Allan believes that Stelco, and presumably the manufacturing community in general, needs government policies which are geared to giving manufacturers a solid foundation for international competition.

Can the minister describe what the Ontario government and his ministry in particular are doing to encourage continuing investment in our manufacturing sector and in particular in our steel and steel-related industries?

Hon Mr Kwinter: I agree with Mr Allan and I think it is important to know—as I am sure all members realize—that Ontario is the manufacturing centre of the country, but I think

that the linkage between the service sector and the manufacturing sector is very strong and very important.

The Premier's Council recognizes the importance of the manufacturing sector and in many of its policies it has actually recommended—and they have been carried out—things that will help: the industrial research fund and the centres of excellence, which are really geared to manufacturing co-operation with the research community.

The Treasurer just spoke recently, in the last question, about his particular initiatives where he has doubled the capital cost allowance and that is a tax incentive of about \$140 million. All of these things encourage the manufacturing sector.

As for the steel industry in particular, we have been helpful in assisting in some of its problems with the United States as far as the free trade agreement is concerned, and we have been encouraging manufacturers in Ontario who are large steel users. I had the honour on Friday of officiating at the opening of the CAMI operation and they are going to be producing 200,000 cars next year—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Ms Oddie Munro: Given the current pressures, however, on the steel industry from both high interest rates and the high value of the Canadian dollar, can the minister tell this House whether he believes that the Canadian steel industry can maintain and improve its strong international competitive position in the 1990s?

Hon Mr Kwinter: We are really blessed in Ontario in that the steel industry we have here has a reputation of being one of the most efficient, one of the most high-tech, one of the best workforces and one of the best quality steel industries in the world. I think it will continue to maintain that position. However, it is under severe pressure.

The federal government, with its high interest rates and the high value of the Canadian dollar, is putting the industry at a severe disadvantage in world competition. But given the fact that analysts predict the automotive industry should pick up again in 1991, and given the fact that they are positioned to be competitive, I think the future will be good for them.

Mr Pouliot: Check with the Treasurer's office. His predictions are off 25%.

The Speaker: Order. Member for Lake Nipigon, your colleague wants to ask a question.

PENSION LEGISLATION

Mr Morin-Strom: I have a question for the Minister of Financial Institutions with respect to when he is going to bring in pension reform legislation for the province of Ontario.

Last week the minister said to us that as long as the New Democratic Party is providing effective opposition to the government's bad legislation on auto insurance, the minister is going to refuse to bring in good legislation on pension reform.

This government has sat on this issue for three years now. Back in March 1989, they issued a number of releases. A major document says, "Ontario unveils proposals for indexing private pensions." There was to be a 60-day consultation period ending May of last year. We are 12 months later. Can the minister give us a specific date when his pension legislation is coming forward?

Hon Mr Elston: I am pleased that the honourable gentleman has asked and commented in his question about the holdup of our legislation on auto insurance because nothing is clearer than the fact that the NDP official opposition, with its

ragtag buddies from the Progressive Conservative Party, is preventing us from processing the legislation to bring into place effective insurance coverage in the province. There are balanced provisions with respect to cost and benefits in store for the people of the province under Bill 68 but those people are preventing our Legislature from functioning.

With respect to pension legislation, how can I promise anybody any progress in this House while the people in the New Democratic Party continue to barrack and prevent us from processing any legislation that is balanced and reasonable? We are, in fact, dealing with all of the material that has come forward with respect to pensions. We are working as hard as we can in processing the legislative agenda that is in front of us and, when we have an opportunity to implement the insurance bill, we will be able to deal more specifically with pension legislation that I am sure those people will help to deal with with dispatch in this House.

Mr Morin-Strom: The minister can run and hide in this Legislature but he will not be able to in an election campaign.

This government has had a majority government for three years now and has done nothing. Basically he is telling us today that the only time we are going to see new pension legislation is when we get a minority government back and we have some say in terms of what he is going to bring forward.

The minister knows that he has been sitting now for five years and the only initiative that has come forward is a result of the accord with the NDP in the last minority government. In the three years of majority government, it has done absolutely zip. Meanwhile, there are thousands of seniors and workers who are nearing pension age who have no protection whatsoever from inflation.

The Speaker: The question?

Mr Morin-Strom: This minister knows that, month by month, there are more people going on to retirement pensions and they have not got the protection of the legislation that the minister promised over a year ago. Can the minister give us a specific date today as to when this legislation is coming forward?

Hon Mr Elston: In this House it is impossible to give any prediction of when legislation will come forward because the opposition will not let us make this place work.

We have been dealing with the material that has come forward, as a result of our document, for consultation. We have looked at what the unions said, and of course the unions will tell the NDP what to say. We have looked at what business has had to say, and of course the PCs will be told by business what they ought to say in opposition.

We will come forward with a balanced presentation of our pension legislation when we, in fact, are able to bring it into the House. It makes no sense for us to bring into this House a piece of legislation that is newly to come forward for consideration, when there are individual people like the member for Welland-Thorold, who spoke for almost a month, took up our business and prevented anybody else from having the floor on the auto insurance material.

It is almost impossible when one member of the Progressive Conservative Party stands up in his place and goes on for days and barracks about other members of this Legislature in a way which is unbecoming not only to that member but to the process in this House. We will bring—

Interjection.

The Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. What a waste of time. Just listening and watching, I think I am going to ask the Board of Internal Economy for some money for Velcro.

1450

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Sterling: In referring to the Minister of Financial Institutions, I would say to him that I would rather be a member of a ragtag party than be a sandbag minister.

The Speaker: Do you have a question?

Mr Sterling: What is the Minister of Education planning to do with regard to the strike in Ottawa-Carleton against the Ottawa Board of Education?

Hon Mr Conway: I thank my learned friend from Manotick for his ongoing interest in the educational situation in Ottawa. I can tell him today what I have told him on a number of previous occasions, and that is, thanks to William Grenville Davis, we have legislation in this province; it is known as Bill 100. I think in an ecumenical way I should say that was one initiative that by and large was well established. It served the province well. It has resolved many more of these situations than it has left unresolved. I can assure my friend from Manotick that I expect both parties in Ottawa are going to accept their responsibilities under that statute and are going to resolve this difficulty at the earliest opportunity in the best interests of the students involved.

Mr Sterling: I would like to say to the Minister of Education from Eganville, in 1985 the Ontario government supported the Ottawa Board of Education to the tune of 19% of its budget. This year the minister is supporting it to the tune of 7% of its budget. Will he consider increasing the percentage of provincial support so the Ottawa Board of Education can sit down and negotiate with the teachers and perhaps give them a little bit more and settle this whole matter?

Hon Mr Conway: My friend from Manotick used to represent Grenville county, a wonderful part of eastern Ontario, and I cannot imagine that he would expect any good Liberal who has got a commitment to the principle of fairness and equalization to divert provincial grants from areas like Grenville or Glengarry, two parts of eastern Ontario represented by my friends in the third party, areas that have nothing like the enormous industrial and commercial wealth that is to be found in Ottawa, a city, interestingly, of declining enrolment over these past years. As a Liberal, I want to be fair to everyone, and that means higher provincial grants in Grenville and Glengarry, and yes, Renfrew, and a formula that takes into account the enormous wealth in Ottawa, where we of course expect that local wealth will be applied to the support of schools.

DETROIT INCINERATOR

Mr McGuigan: My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Last week, while watching TV from Detroit, I saw them broadcast the hearings of the Michigan Air Pollution Control Commission. These hearings were on the prospect of cleaning up that garbage incinerator that is spewing effluent down on the people of Essex and Kent counties and, in fact, all of southwestern Ontario. I would like to ask the minister whether the

changes that they made are environmentally safe for the people of southwestern Ontario.

Hon Mr Bradley: That is a very good question. The member has asked this previously.

I want to allay the concerns of the leader of the third party, who felt that perhaps this would take up the entire question period, by saying that I am suffering from laryngitis and as a result I may not be able to elaborate as much as I usually do.

The answer to the member's question is certainly no. We sent the director of the air resources branch of the Ministry of the Environment to testify at this hearing. The problem with the deal for that specific incinerator is that it calls for years of delay before there is an installation of the kind of pollution abatement equipment that we feel is necessary.

The stand we have taken from the beginning is that there is a need for what is called the scrubber baghouse technology. Here they were building a brand-new incinerator where the opportunity was there to install that. The deal they have come up with in fact does not call for that; it calls for too long a delay before there is an installation of the kind of equipment we believe is necessary to protect the people of Essex county, the people of Windsor and indeed the people of Detroit.

Mr McGuigan: This decree was approved by the Michigan commission following a long meeting and, as the minister mentioned, it was over Ontario's objections. What, if any, further steps can we take to protect the people of southwestern Ontario?

Hon Mr Bradley: The member would recall that the province of Ontario initiated a court case in the state of Michigan in opposition to the incinerator being allowed to start up. In fact, early on in the court proceedings, the operating agency working for the city of Detroit tried to use procedural methods to prevent our case from going forward. We were in fact successful in pushing those aside. We were successful in terms of the court, because the court indicated clearly that the province of Ontario was right in the procedure that it was following. Therefore, it is our intention to continue that court case.

I mentioned at the time when they were talking about a special deal before the commission that it was the intention of the province of Ontario to continue to pursue our court case until such time as they install—

The Speaker: Thank you.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Allen: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. One of the major problems affecting the social assistance reforms has been the slow take-up of STEP, the supports to employment program. Various groups coming before the food bank hearings pointed out that, for example, in Toronto the access of the STEP was 0.6%. A survey by the Daily Bread Food Bank indicated that two thirds of the recipients were not aware of the reforms. Another group reported that municipalities in Ontario do not understand the details of the document.

It is becoming clear why that is the case. There is a full-scale revolt, as some would have it, among field workers in the regional offices. Their case loads are so heavy, and the minister has not implemented that particularly important item in the first-stage reforms which asks him to reduce case loads so that the other reforms might go ahead successfully. When is he going to reduce case loads in the family benefits sector in the regional offices?

1500

Hon Mr Beer: We are concerned about the increases in case loads that we have had and we have been trying to do a number of things to lessen that increase, particularly so that people can work on STEP, which in terms of the takeup has proven to be a very positive program.

The honourable member would want to know that we have added resources to the ministry to assist in this area. There are still problems that we have not completely overcome, but it is my belief that the approach of the field workers has been a very positive one, and what we are trying to do is to assist them in lowering the case load. I would hope that, barring a series of major shifts and more people having to go on to family benefits, we would be able to see some progress there. We recognize that for STEP to work properly, our staff must have the time to be able to deal with the clients. That is one of the reasons, as the honourable member knows, that we put out this pamphlet to advertise STEP and to try to get more people to take it up.

Mr Allen: The pamphlet will not help if the workers will not pass it on, and that is basically what is happening. The information is not being passed on, deliberately, because of the additional case load that will be entailed.

The minister may want to go back to the document and realize that between 1980-81 and 1986-87, the case load of those workers went up 33% and the workload per case went up 41%. They stood at 332 persons on the average that was the responsibility of a single worker. Our survey around the province indicates those numbers are still in effect, still over 300, and in the city of Toronto at this stage it is 339-plus persons per worker. You cannot get blood out of a stone and you cannot push workers beyond a certain point. When is the minister going to reduce the case load in order to make the whole Social Assistance Review Committee reform effective out there in the field?

Hon Mr Beer: I think there are two points I would want to make to the honourable member. None the less, with the heavy case loads, in fact the number of people who are joining and taking advantage of STEP is going up, and we can show that through the statistics. We recognize that to the extent we can deal more effectively with the issue of case load, in fact that will be able to go up at an even greater rate. I can assure the honourable member that that is an issue of some concern, not only to me but to all of us who want this program to work, and we are trying to bring forward a number of initiatives that will see that case load drop.

ACCESS TO POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr Pope: My question is to the Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities. I gave him some indication earlier that I would be asking.

Last December I raised the problem of admission of certain northern Ontario students to the school of pharmacy at the University of Toronto. Dean Perrier of the University of Toronto saw fit to reply to the minister, and I will just quote one paragraph from that letter very briefly:

"It is ironic that Mr Pope and the Lauzons have criticized the policy of regional admission quotas, which is designed to assure students in areas outside Metropolitan Toronto, in particular northern and eastern Ontario, have access to the faculty. Without the quota system, Metro Toronto students would dominate our faculty student body. For example, while Metro Toronto and Mississauga have approximately 30% of Ontario's

population, 45% of the most qualified students would have come from this area."

Does the Minister of Colleges and Universities share Dean Perrier's attitude and opinion that students from eastern and northern Ontario are less academically qualified and less intelligent than students from Toronto?

Hon Mr Conway: I have been in this assembly for 13 years with the member for Cochrane South, and I have known him in those years to be an intelligent and in most cases fair-minded fellow.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Conway: Setting aside the peculiar fact that he is not supporting his northern colleague in the leadership campaign, I can tell him that is not the way I would read Dean Perrier's letter, and I am certain that is not the way the honourable member for Cochrane South reads the letter.

Mr Pope: I certainly do. According to him, academic qualifications will be the cornerstone of admissions to his faculty and he thinks that northern Ontario students, given the academic qualification test, would be less qualified and would have less of a per capita admission.

Mr B. Rae: That isn't what he's saying.

Mr Pope: It certainly is what he is saying. He is saying they would have 45% and not 30%.

I want to ask the Minister of Colleges and Universities, since the regional quotas are not being relied upon by this faculty—in fact, 43% of the students are coming from the greater Toronto area, and in fact it is not 30%, which it would be if the regional quota system were put in place—when are we going to get some fairness and equality for eastern and northern Ontario students in admissions to professional schools in this province?

Hon Mr Conway: If the honourable member for Cochrane South is to be believed, then perhaps the member for Nipissing is better off than we might imagine in this leadership campaign.

Mr Villeneuve: Quite an answer.

Mr McCague: What's that got to do with it?

Hon Mr Conway: Well, I have to say to my fair-minded friends in the Tory caucus that for the member for Cochrane South, the former Attorney General of this province, to get up and characterize Dean Perrier's letter in the way he has is, quite frankly, not to the credit of our friend from Timmins. He is just better than that.

I have pursued the member's interest in this case. I have spoken to the family, I have talked to the faculty of pharmacy at the University of Toronto, and the dean has assured me that the Lauzon case was one where the individual applicant was not admitted because the academic standing and the score on the standardized test, the so-called PCAT, were not as high as they had to be to meet the minimum for the year in which she had applied.

It is my view, on the basis of all things taken into account, that the system that is in place is quite fair and that in fact the admissions of students from northern and eastern Ontario in the last three or four years have been above what the quota would have called for. So I think, all things taken into account, the system is fair and it is not at all as described by my friend from Timmins.

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr M. C. Ray: I have a question for the Treasurer, and it concerns again the question of the government policy of relocation of government jobs to areas outside the Metropolitan Toronto area and in particular to the city of Windsor.

The Treasurer will know that last week I asked the Minister of Government Services whether or not the budget the Treasurer has prepared included funds for the relocation of government jobs to the city of Windsor. The minister neither confirmed nor denied that the budget did provide such money, but he did indicate the matter was under review.

I would like now to direct the same question to the Treasurer, and I ask: When can the city of Windsor and the residents of the city of Windsor expect some positive action on this very important matter to our community?

Hon R. F. Nixon: I want to congratulate the honourable member on the informed and, in fact, relentless way in which he pursues this matter of such importance to his own community.

The honourable member would recall there was a reference, somewhat vague if not veiled, in the budget speech that indicated the policy of the government to move full-time government jobs out of the greater Toronto area was going to continue. We had substantial success in the 1,600 to 1,700 jobs located in northern Ontario, with the ancillary commitment of \$300 million in capital.

Mr D. S. Cooke: No, Windsor is in the south.

Hon R. F. Nixon: This is well received by the thoughtful people in the north, although it has never been reflected by any of the NDP members representing the north, mostly because they are not thoughtful.

The Speaker: That completes the allotted time for oral questions and responses.

Hon R. F. Nixon: Shucks.

The Speaker: I know many members will be very disappointed, but it is now time for petitions.

1510

PETITIONS

NATUROPATHY

Mr Mackenzie: I have a petition. It is signed by 20 citizens speaking on behalf of the Natural Healers Association. I affix my name to it and forward it.

GREATER TORONTO AREA

Mr Philip: I have another petition, which reads as follows:

"Whereas the Peterson Liberal government has decided to charge drivers in greater Metropolitan Toronto \$90 per year for a car licence plate while at the same time only charging residents in other parts of Ontario \$33 per year for identical licence plates;

"Whereas the same Peterson Liberal government has in this year's budget imposed other taxes and levies on the people in businesses in greater Metropolitan Toronto which are not imposed on those in other parts of Ontario;

"Whereas these taxes which are not based on income or profits hurt seniors and others on fixed incomes;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario to express to the Liberal government our great disapproval of its

policies of tax discrimination against the people of greater Metropolitan Toronto."

I have signed it and I agree with it. I would have given it a summary, but my summary would have been longer.

DRUG BENEFITS

Mr Cordiano: I have a petition that reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to have a drug plan legislated such that individuals who are receiving CPP disability pensions be permitted equal recognition as conventional CPP recipients."

It is signed by 63 people and I have also signed the petition.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SCHOOL BOARD CONSEIL SCOLAIRE DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE

M. Poirier : J'ai deux pétitions : la première de l'Association des parents et enseignants de l'école Sainte-Félicité de Clarence Creek, 198 signatures ; et la deuxième de l'Association des parents et enseignants de l'école Sainte-Trinité de Rockland, 237 signatures, demandant la mise sur pied d'un conseil scolaire de langue française dans la région des comtés unis de Prescott et Russell.

WATER-PLAY FACILITY

Mr Ballinger: I am in receipt of three petitions, one on behalf of the Honourable Charles Beer, to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. The first reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"We, the undersigned, strongly object to the proposed water-play facility at Boyd Conservation Area."

It is signed by 467 people.

LICENCE PLATE FEES

Mr Ballinger: I have another petition, which reads as follows:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"We wish to express our opposition to the increase to \$90 for car licences for Brock township residents."

It is signed by 119 residents.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Ballinger: I have another petition, which reads as follows:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"We hereby register our deep concern and outrage over the provisions of the new Ontario motorist protection plan.

"We respectfully request that the Legislature consider substantial amendment of, or complete rejection of the Ontario motorist protection plan, as presently proposed."

It is signed by 64 signatures.

EMPLOYER HEALTH TAX

Mr Adams: I have a petition concerning the employer health tax on behalf of almost 300 people who live in the vicinity of Peterborough. These include virtually everyone who

is actively involved in the real estate market at the present time. It reads:

"We, the undersigned, wish to draw your attention again to the inequity of the newly imposed employer health tax. This tax should be fair. Everyone should contribute and pay a health tax. Everyone should pay the same percentage. Everyone's tax should be based on the same level of remuneration, not some before expenses and some after expenses."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Allen moved first reading of Bill 165, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act.

Motion agreed to.

The Speaker: The member may have a brief explanation, or was that done in members' statements?

Mr Allen: No, I will give the statement of purpose here. The bill is designed to address the garbage crisis in Ontario by amending the Environmental Protection Act to provide regulations that would, for example, establish provincial programs to help municipalities achieve a 50% reduction of garbage going to landfills by the year 2000, establish timetables for prohibiting the disposal of certain wastes in landfills, lay down a plan for the phasing out of used containers and packaging for which there are alternatives, designate disposable products for which there are non-disposable substitutes available and prohibit the use of such products, prescribe durability standards for consumer products, require municipalities to establish blue box recycling programs and require all residents to separate their recyclables.

JABKO HOLDINGS LTD ACT, 1990

Mr Owen moved first reading of Bill Pr76, An Act to revive Jabko Holdings Ltd.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on government notice of motion number 30 on time allocation in relation to Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance.

The Speaker: I believe the member for Leeds-Grenville adjourned the debate. Do you have any further comments?

Mr Runciman: You have an excellent memory, Mr Speaker.

It was interesting to note the comments of the Minister of Financial Institutions in respect to me during a response to a question earlier, when he was expressing concern about some comments I was making about some of his Liberal colleagues and suggesting these were some sort of personal attacks. I want to say that they are not personal attacks at all. If anyone wants to look at the record, I think it clearly indicates a failing on the part of the members in respect to properly representing the constituents, the people who put them in office. All I have been attempting to do is draw those shortcomings, those failings of the Liberal members of this Legislature to the attention of their constituents and again reinforce, if you will, the fact that these

people are simply not doing the job that you put them in office to do. They are simply facts.

I am not launching any personal attacks on the character of any individual member of this Legislature; I am simply saying, reiterating time and time again, that the Liberal members have failed to do their jobs on this particular piece of no-fault legislation, as mean and nasty a piece of legislation as this House has seen. It is going to hurt innocent accident victims right across this province. It is a harmful piece of business, a nasty piece of business, and I think the Liberal members have a great deal to answer for in respect to the way they have failed to stand up on behalf of their constituents. They have simply failed all those people in this province, the head-injured, people who are going to suffer psychological injuries and damage as a result of auto accidents, who will no longer, as a result of this legislation, have the opportunity to take the at-fault driver to court, to gain access to the courts. That is a reality.

Again, it may bother some of the Liberal backbenchers and some of the Liberal members of the executive council because they simply have not been doing their jobs. I know that hurts. They do not like me to say that; they do not like me mentioning their names and telling their constituents, urging their constituents to give these people a call and tell them to start doing their jobs, start representing their constituents in a way in which they should be representing them. They are not doing it, they have not been doing it and they show no inclination whatsoever up to this point to do anything about this very dangerous piece of legislation. Certainly they do not seem to express any concern about the motion we are dealing with today, which shuts off meaningful debate, restricts debate to the point where only the critic for the NDP and the critic for the Progressive Conservative Party have an opportunity to speak at length in respect to this legislation.

We have heard some criticism—this is my fourth day on my feet speaking to this bill—and criticism of the NDP member who went on for a considerably longer period. The reality is that the government, in an arrogant overreaction, cut off debate on this bill and brought in time allocation which would restrict debate to two days in committee of the whole and one day on third reading—three days on this piece of legislation which is going to affect six million drivers in this province and many others in respect to families and friends who could be negatively impacted upon as a result of an auto accident in this province.

1520

Mr Kormos: The Liberals don't care about little people, just big corporate insurance executives. That's who they owe their allegiance to.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Kormos: Well, it's true, Mr Speaker.

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, the member for Middlesex.

Mr Runciman: This is a tag-team match.

Mr Reycraft: You and the socialists.

Mr Runciman: Let's face it, these guys are in government because of the socialists. That is a reality. The Liberals kissed their butts.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr Kormos: So what do they owe to the insurance companies?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, the member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Kerrio: But we divorced them.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Please, the standing orders.

Mr Runciman: It is ironic having these comments come across the floor about the Conservatives being in bed with the socialists. Let's face the facts: we are talking about a government and some of its key players who certainly do not have any difficulty with socialism at all. We had the most massive intervention in the private sector in the form of Bill 2, the establishment of the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board, back in the fall of 1987, the most massive intervention in the private sector in the history of this province. You did not mind that. Your key players did not mind that. I call that socialism, folks, so do not throw those sorts of things across the floor at me. We are standing up here because—

The Deputy Speaker: The standing orders call for the members to address the Speaker directly and only the Speaker. I am sure the member for Leeds-Grenville will remember that, please.

Mr Runciman: Mr Speaker, I simply want to point out to you that one of the key players in this legislation is the Attorney General of Ontario. The Attorney General happens to be, for the edification of the viewers, perhaps, when we are talking about socialism, a former fund-raiser for the New Democratic Party of Ontario. Are people aware of that? One of the key players in formulating this legislation was a former fund-raiser for the New Democrats.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls, please.

Mr Runciman: We talk about the rationale behind this legislation. These folks are in this because of what they perceive to be short-term political gain.

Mr Kormos: They're in it because—

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, please.

Mr Runciman: We look at the Attorney General, a staunch supporter of the NDP a few years ago. Now he is sitting in the front benches of the Liberal Party of Ontario. Why is he there? He is there because he is an opportunist. I believe he went there because he had an opportunity to have access to power and influence on legislation such as this and Bill 2, this massive intervention in the private sector.

The Deputy Speaker: Will the member stick to the debate, please.

Mr Runciman: Okay. I was agitated, Mr Speaker, as you can appreciate.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: I am certainly trying to stick to the debate, Mr Speaker, and to the terms that you are laying down for me.

I spent some time yesterday talking about the member for Hamilton Centre and the difficulty she has faced as a result of her failure, if you will, to speak out on behalf of the head-injured and others who are going to be negatively impacted upon by this legislation. I have a letter which I think is of some interest and related to what I said yesterday about that member. It is addressed to the Hamilton Centre Provincial Liberal Association, dated 26 March, and reads:

"Dear Sirs:

"Recently I received a ticket order form for a fund-raiser for Lily Oddie Munro to be held on 1 May 1990.

"Liberalism, the Liberal Party and my family go back many years, as some of you may be aware. As a matter of fact, my father ran for the Liberal Party provincially in the September 1963 election. I remember working on that election as well as many others, both federally and provincially. As well, I recall my unquestioned commitment and financial support to the Liberal Party during the time it was in the desert, so to speak, and out of power.

"During those years the Liberal Party espoused those principles and ideals that made one proud to be a Liberal. The Liberal Party's introduction of the Ontario motorist protection plan and Lily Oddie Munro's recent position on this legislation, as observed in committee, has forced me to re-evaluate my support for the Liberal Party. All of us can argue the merits of this issue until doomsday. That is not the purpose of this letter.

"In short, I oppose this legislation because it takes away fundamental rights of justice from innocent motor vehicle accident victims. This situation is totally unacceptable to me as a citizen of this province. Please accept this correspondence as notice of my desire to cancel my membership in the provincial Liberal Party."

And this is of special interest to you, Mr Speaker:

"Please also take note that I have joined the provincial Conservative Party as a personal sign of protest and will contribute time and money to their candidates in an attempt to rid Ontario of this outrageous legislation. Moreover, I will actively encourage all of my friends, family and associates to turn their support away from the provincial Liberal Party. What the provincial Liberal Party is doing to this province by implementing the Ontario motorist protection plan is scandalous."

It is signed by Jerry Ingrassia from Hamilton, Ontario, a resident of the Hamilton Centre riding, which is supposedly being represented by that member referred to in the letter.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: I want to very briefly run through the amendments, or at least some of them, that the Progressive Conservative Party is going to be introducing during the very brief committee-of-the-whole process available.

Mr Wildman: You won't have time; only two days.

Mr Runciman: We will not have time to discuss these at length, because of the Liberal government's time allocation motion which is cutting off meaningful debate. We have a number, which I am going to put on the record now, and I want to again express concern about the fact that members of my party and members of the NDP are not going to have an opportunity to deal with these amendments in a meaningful way, and a host of other concerns which they are simply not going to have an

opportunity to talk about because of the limitation the Liberals have placed upon debate on this bill.

They do not want the people of Ontario to understand what the implications of this legislation are, how negatively it is going to impact on all of us in this province. They simply do not want the people to know. They get up and talk about the no-fault side of this thing. Obviously that is in their best interest, but they do not talk about the significant downsides to this legislation, and that of course is the reason behind this effort to restrict and cut off debate and limit the opportunity for opposition members, limited in number as we are, to have any significant impact on this legislation in respect to perhaps having it amended in a way which will benefit Ontarians generally.

The first amendment will be to section 57 of the bill, subsection 321a(1) of the act. As currently written, this section of Bill 68 eliminates an accident victim's right to sue for economic loss unless his or her injuries meet the threshold. The Progressive Conservative amendment would change the threshold so that it applies only to non-economic loss or non-economic damage. Every accident victim in Ontario would still be entitled to sue for economic loss or damage.

In no jurisdiction in North America in which a system of threshold automobile insurance is in place has the right to sue for economic loss been tied into meeting the threshold test. In all other jurisdictions the right to sue for economic loss is maintained, irrespective of whether or not one can sue for pain and suffering. Although there may be some argument that there is some moral justification for giving up the right to claim for pain and suffering in return for increased no-fault benefits, there can be no similar moral or social justification that an individual should be forced to give up the right to sue for loss of earnings that are not covered by the no-fault benefits schedule in return for reducing premiums at large of the motoring public of Ontario.

Without full compensation for economic loss, innocent accident victims could lose their homes or their businesses, or both. The Ontario Automobile Insurance Board, on page 47 of its report to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, dated 14 July 1989, stated the following: "Threshold no-fault systems permit recovery of economic losses, but preclude recovery of non-pecuniary losses where the level of injury sustained fails to satisfy a defined threshold, which may be verbal or monetary."

1530

Clearly, the Kruger commission had indicated that any threshold system considered under its mandate would permit recovery for economic loss. In fact, the Kruger commission only considered threshold plans which provide full compensation for economic loss to innocent accident victims.

I might say that our party struggled with the question of whether or not we should be introducing amendments, because we do not think this legislation, the no-fault thrust, is at all in the best interest of Ontarians. We certainly would like to see a retention of tort and changes recommended by Justice Osborne and others.

But we realize that we are dealing with a huge majority of the Liberal government, that this legislation is before us and that perhaps what we have to do, as an opposition party, is present amendments which can improve the legislation, make it better for Ontarians, even though we have some strong disagreements with the principle of no-fault.

We do not think it is the way to go, but the legislation is before us and we feel, as an opposition party, that it is our responsibility to introduce these amendments on behalf of the

many interest groups that appeared before us in an effort to try and make this legislation somewhat more palatable.

The next amendment we will be introducing during committee of the whole is again to section 57, subsection 231a(1) of the act. As currently written, this section of the bill states that disfigurement must be permanent and serious in order for an accident victim to be allowed to proceed with litigation.

The Progressive Conservative amendment places the word "or" between the words "permanent" and "serious." It lessens the burden of proof for innocent accident victims. An injury need not be permanent to be serious or likewise be serious to be permanent. Placement of the word "or" between the words "permanent" and "serious" does not detract from the government's stated purpose, to compensate those who are most affected by an automobile accident.

Requirement of permanency together with seriousness introduces value judgements in the threshold test. What if an injury is permanent and serious presently, but may not be considered serious permanently or seriously permanent? Would injury still be considered permanent if it is anticipated that with medical advances there could be remedies in the future? As written, this section of Bill 68 has too much subjective terminology.

The member for Mississauga South, who has been very active in support of the disabled community, reminds me that this amendment which I have just read into the record has been requested by the disabled community. I want to applaud the efforts of the member for Mississauga South, who is constantly speaking out in support of the disabled in the province.

The next amendment we will be introducing in the very brief time allocated to us by the Liberal government is again to section 57, clause 231a(1)(b) of the act. As currently written, this section of the bill presents a very restrictive threshold which must be met in order for accident victims to be allowed to proceed with litigation.

The Progressive Conservative amendment recognizes psychological injuries and removes subjective terminology such as "important bodily function," "continuing injury" and "physical in nature." The threshold definition specifically excludes emotional and mental injuries and it is difficult to predict with precision how the courts will interpret these stringent requirements.

It has been suggested that Bill 68 is most closely related to the Michigan threshold. However, in Michigan the injured person need not prove that the injury is permanent nor must the injury be objectively manifested. Rather, a Michigan claimant will meet his state's threshold if the injury is both serious and medically identifiable. There is no requirement in Michigan that the injury be continuing or physical in nature or affect an important bodily function.

The requirement that the injury be physical in nature is discriminatory. Psychological injuries, including depression, anxiety and pain disorders, are real and legitimately disabling. Section 15(1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms states that, "Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability."

I will be talking about that element of this legislation at greater length a little later. There is a good chance that Bill 68 is inconsistent with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and I will, as I said, be discussing an opinion given by Gordon Henderson,

a noted constitutional expert and former colleague of the Attorney General, with respect to that matter.

Our next amendment is again to section 57 of the bill, subsection 231a(4) of the act. As it is currently written, this section allows insurance companies two occasions to challenge accident victims with respect to the threshold. Even if the victim is successful on a pre-trial motion to determine whether he or she meets the threshold, the defence can still raise the issue at trial.

The Progressive Conservative amendment removes this section from the bill. There is absolutely no incentive for a victim to have his or her case determined at any time other than the trial. A plaintiff may incur considerable expense in pursuing a claim, only to find out at the time of trial that his or her injuries do not pass the threshold. Such uncertainty will discourage a number of injured accident victims whose injuries would pass the threshold, if they would only incur the expense to test the threshold.

The inherent uncertainty will mean it is only the rich who will test the threshold. Lower-income individuals will be discouraged by the high costs of attempting to test the threshold, and such a result of justice only for the rich is clearly undesirable.

I doubt if any of the Liberal members were paying any attention to that when I talked about the Premier, the member for London Centre, yesterday with respect to not having any empathy or understanding for those less fortunate in society. I clearly pointed out that this legislation is going to impact negatively very much upon those in society who are unemployed, individuals earning minimum wage and those who have significant difficulties in society. Those are the kinds of people who are going to suffer most harshly as a result of this legislation.

I suggested that perhaps the reasons the Premier does not have any real appreciation of the plight of individuals and families who are living in such economic circumstances is the fact that he has never had to face those kinds

of difficulties in his own life. He has never had to worry about meeting a mortgage payment or putting groceries on the table to feed his children. He was born into a very comfortable existence.

We talked about one of his main occupations on the weekend being jogging around his Rosedale mansion, checking out blue boxes of his neighbours to see what kind of wine they are consuming. That is the priority of the Premier of this province, when we are talking about legislation before this House which he has instigated as a result of his 1987 promise, an irresponsible promise which could not be kept. We have brought in legislation which is going to hurt the people in our society who can least afford to be hurt. I think if we look back on the Premier's own lifestyle and upbringing, perhaps that will provide us with some understanding and some explanation of where we are today.

The next amendment is again to section 57 of the bill, clause 231b(1)(c) of the act. As currently written, this section of the bill states that insurance companies will be required to pay benefits only after the accident victim has exhausted all benefits available under any income continuation plan he or she has.

The Progressive Conservative amendment removes this section of the bill. Insurance companies must pay the applicable no-fault benefits regardless of any income continuation plans held by the accident victim. Income continuation plans are implemented for the benefit of employees in order to protect the interruption of their income due to some other sickness.

It is always understood that the risk of income loss due to an injury in an automobile accident would ultimately be covered by automobile insurance. If these losses are no longer to be covered under the proposed auto insurance plan, it clearly has to be more costly to employers and employees to provide these income continuation benefits.

Our next amendment which I will put on the record—we may be discussing some of these at length a little later on—

Mr Wildman: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I do not like to interrupt my friend the member for Leeds-Grenville, but I do not see a quorum. If that is the case, it certainly indicates the arrogance of the Liberal Party, not willing to even listen to this debate.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1541

Mr Runciman: I think it is indicative of the interest of the Liberal members when they have the largest majority government in the history of this province and they cannot even maintain a quorum in this House. They are trying to cut off debate by the opposition. They are not giving us an opportunity to discuss this.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for Leeds-Grenville will debate the motion.

Mr Runciman: We are talking about time allocation. I think it is relevant to mention that we had to have a quorum call because of a 94-seat majority government that could not maintain a quorum in this House.

I think it clearly indicates the arrogance of this government, the way it has treated this issue from the beginning, the way it has treated witnesses who have appeared before us, the way it has treated Her Majesty's loyal opposition with respect to the opportunity to have meaningful debate on this issue, and the way it has treated, with contempt I believe—I said this yesterday in regard to the interjections of those members of the Liberal Party who were here yesterday when I was expressing concerns that have been presented to us by thousands of people across this province.

We had these inane interjections coming from Liberal backbenchers. To me that shows contempt for those people who appeared before us as witnesses, people like Barbara Turnbull, people like Jeremy Rempel, who appeared before us in a wheelchair, talking about his accident and his concern for future innocent accident victims in this province. The Liberal backbenchers and their cabinet colleagues are just showing contempt for all of those very caring, concerned people, who have no vested interest, nothing to gain, by the passage or failure of this legislation. They were there because they genuinely, sincerely care about future innocent accident victims in this province.

I think it has to go on the record that, with 94 Liberal members, they cannot even maintain a quorum on a consistent basis in this Legislature. The reality is that most of them have nothing to do anyway. What they are all here for is hoping to get a chauffeur-driven limousine, be a parliamentary assistant, get access to one of these unlimited expense accounts, plush offices, perhaps a chairmanship of a crown corporation or an agency, board or commission of the government. They are obviously not here to stand up on behalf of the innocent accident victims of this province.

Mr Neumann: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe the rules of the House prohibit members from imputing motives to other members.

Mr Wildman: On the point of order, Mr Speaker: The member for Leeds-Grenville did not mean to impute motives to the Liberals. Obviously, the Liberals have no motives.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Leeds-Grenville will proceed and be very careful.

Mr Ballinger: A right-wing zealot and a socialist you-know-what.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: Who is that? That is the member for Durham-York. Does he never get tired of having himself around?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for Leeds-Grenville will address the Speaker and watch his words carefully.

Mr Runciman: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Another amendment which will be introduced by the Progressive Conservative Party is again to section 57 of the bill, clause 231b(1)(d). As currently written, this section of the bill forces an accident victim to exhaust all company benefits before an insurance company is required to pay any no-fault benefits.

The Progressive Conservative amendment eliminates this section of the bill and rightly forces insurance companies to pay no-fault benefits regardless of whether or not the accident victim has a sick leave plan at the place of employment. Under Bill 68, the employee may have to use up sick leave credits and thus lose protection against income loss due to a future sickness or disability. Since the automobile insurer may pay very little where sick leave benefits exist, workers will be paying for automobile insurance for which they have very little chance of collecting compensation. In addition, the cost of sick leave plans will increase.

Sick leave is an earned benefit to protect the employee from interruption of income. It was never intended to protect against loss of income due to automobile accidents. Employees should not have to absorb this loss. This section provides an incentive for insurance companies to seek out those insureds who have sick leave plans at their places of employment. The bill cannot stop insurance companies from cherry-picking.

We talked about access to the courts in the earlier amendment and the fact that the justice system under this bill in respect to taking the insurance company to court is only going to apply to the rich in society, in respect to their ability to challenge the threshold, to see whether their injuries can pierce the threshold. This is another element that impacts in a dramatic way upon the less fortunate in society.

We are talking about people who for many reasons cannot have income replacement plans, do not have sick leave benefits at their place of employment, or perhaps are unemployed or earning minimum wage or something in that neighbourhood, and are living in Metropolitan Toronto. I am not sure what the survival wage would be in Metropolitan Toronto, but individuals who are living below the poverty line certainly would suffer as a result of this legislation with respect to their ability to get auto insurance, what we are talking about in respect to cherry-picking.

For the benefit of viewers and for the benefit of the one or two Liberal members who may be paying attention to this debate, we are talking about insurance companies that are going

to look at the risk any consumer coming to them poses. If a consumer has an income replacement plan, has sick leave benefits, that consumer poses much less of a risk to an insurance company than the individual in society who does not have those kinds of benefits.

What we are going to see is a referral of those individuals to the high-priced Facility Association, because as I said, they pose a higher risk to the insurance company. What we have seen up to this point is a significant increase already in the Facility Association, something up to the neighbourhood of a 300% increase in the past year and a half. Under this legislation, I think we are going to see a much more dramatic increase.

1550

We were talking a couple of days ago about the state of Massachusetts, which instituted a process similar to Bill 2, brought in in 1987. On the last day of public hearings on Bill 2, the establishment of the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board, the establishment of a rate-setting authority by the provincial government, it was indicated that Massachusetts, with a similar system, had close to 60% of drivers in the high-priced Facility and a good chunk of the insurance companies had been chased out of the state.

Despite those warnings and despite that information available to the government, it continued along its course of self-destruction and cost all of us, as taxpayers, millions and millions of dollars. We are still paying the bill. There seems to be no end in sight to this government's ability to mismanage the insurance issue.

The next amendment we will be introducing in committee of the whole, whenever it arrives, is again to section 57 of the bill, subsection 231b(6) of the act. This section of the bill states that the collateral source rule of Bill 68 comes into effect on 23 October 1989. That was seven months ago. It should come into effect with the rest of Bill 68. The Progressive Conservative amendment removes this arbitrary inception date. As it is, Bill 68 will not be operational until well into 1990. How far into 1990 depends on how astute certain members of the government may be. But in any event, Bill 68 will not be operational until well into 1990. It is ludicrous to have retroactive sections of this bill, especially when they favour insurance companies.

The legislation calls for the deduction of sick bank benefits, disability benefits, and all other forms of benefits received by any injured individuals from the value of their claims, assuming their claims meet the threshold. The legislation, as written, requires that this deduction occur in respect of any claim of action that arises following 23 October 1989.

Thus, persons injured after 23 October 1989 will be negatively affected. These individuals will lose their sick bank benefits, but receive none of the enhanced benefits which the new legislation proposes by way of the amended no-fault benefits schedule. Persons caught in this grey area are being hit with a double whammy—lost sick benefits, etc, and none of the promised enhanced benefits. The government should not, ex post facto, alter terms of automobile insurance contracts resulting in a reduction in benefits for drivers, unless at the same time it forces insurance companies to make a partial, pro rata refund of premium. The government is changing the contract terms without a necessary reflection in price.

Mr Faubert: Back to the researcher. Back to your writers.

Mr Runciman: Again we have the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere. We should really give him a minute to tell us all he knows.

Mr Faubert: I've been listening for three days and I haven't heard a thing from you.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: I said yesterday that the only thing that member has ever achieved on his own is dandruff.

Mr Faubert: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I take the opportunity to say that he said he would yield the floor to me. If he is doing that, I will so take the floor.

The Deputy Speaker: The member will please sit down. The member for Leeds-Grenville may proceed.

Mr Runciman: Only that gentleman's varicose veins keep him from being completely colourless.

Mr Faubert: Get a new writer, Bob. I've got 1,000 insults too. I'll send them over to you.

Mr Runciman: I thought it was pretty good myself.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: Where was I?

Mr Haggerty: Lost.

Mr Kerrio: You were working up some dandruff.

Mr Faubert: You weren't anywhere. Back where you started.

Mr Runciman: I will not get into that. I will save my voice for what is more important here. We are talking about the amendments the Progressive Conservative Party is going to introduce during committee of the whole, which we will not have an opportunity to discuss at length because of the restriction placed upon us by the government, so I am taking this opportunity to put those amendments on the record and perhaps explain some of the rationale behind the submission of these amendments.

I was talking about Bill 68 and the collateral source rule. The government's own actuarial report 24—Report on the Hybrid Threshold No-fault Insurance System of 19 June 1989 done by Eckler Partners Ltd—confirms that a refund is in order. The author of that report, Joe Cheng, writes on page 6 of the report, "Therefore, on the effective (proclamation) date of the hybrid threshold no-fault law, some motorists may get a pro rata refund on their unearned premiums if their current premiums are much higher than the hybrid threshold premiums and if there is a mandatory rollback."

The next amendment is again to section 57 of the bill. I want to say that during committee hearings, when we were doing clause-by-clause on this legislation, the committee never got to section 57. The debate was cut off before committee had the opportunity to talk about amendments such as this in committee during clause-by-clause. Those are the kinds of time restrictions we have been operating under from the outset and that the government has continued to apply to members of the opposition once the debate moved into the Legislature itself, into the assembly.

The government complains about the outdated benefits currently available in the system today. However, it has not indexed the new schedule of no-fault benefits. The Progressive Conservative amendment provides an indexing formula for the new schedule of no-fault benefits. The government has said time and again that the new scheme will enhance the archaic levels of compensation. However, by not indexing these new benefits, it is falling into the same trap. No-fault benefits were last altered in 1978. The government sat on a recommendation

made by Mr Justice Coulter Osborne that the schedule of accident benefits be increased immediately.

Why should innocent accident victims suffer a real decrease in benefits when inflation takes place? Given the government's track record to date, what assurances do we have that the level of benefits will be reviewed periodically, as promised by the minister? Those are the amendments I wish to put on the record today.

I want to talk about a number of other things, and one of them is the constitutionality question I have discussed previously. Hopefully I have the letter from Mr Henderson, which I can read into the record.

We were talking the other day about costs and the irresponsibility of the Liberal government in respect of its handling of the insurance issue and the waste of taxpayers' dollars.

It has been suggested that anywhere between \$12 million and \$15 million was wasted on the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board, on its efforts to produce two reports which were ignored by the government and the costs associated with that. There is the \$142-million or \$143-million tax break that is going to the insurance industry, which represents something in the neighbourhood of \$16 for every man, woman and child in this province with respect to increased taxes. That is a \$143-million tax break—the 3% tax on premiums and the OHIP subrogation agreement—a \$143-million windfall to the industry representing in the neighbourhood of \$16 per person in increased taxes across this province.

We talked about other moneys being wasted, about the fact that on the dispute resolution system the government has no handle whatsoever on what it is going to cost us, what kind of bureaucracy is going to be required, what kind of workload there will be and what kind of backlog these people are going to be faced with. I have cited in the past the analogy between this new dispute resolution mechanism for auto insurance and the rent review system in this province, which is now costing taxpayers somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$40 million to \$50 million a year, with backlogs of one to two years of people trying to get their applications to rent review heard.

That is the kind of horrific nightmare we could be facing with respect to this dispute resolution process being instituted under this legislation. No one knows what it is going to cost us. When I asked the Deputy Minister of Financial Institutions in early December 1989—

Mr Kormos: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I am sorely disappointed that once again the Liberals are being paid for a full day's work but they will not show up to listen. There is physically not a quorum here. Shame on the Liberals.

The Deputy Speaker: Are you asking for a quorum?

Mr Kormos: Yes, sir.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1602

Mr Runciman: It is a sad testimony to the interest of Liberal members and Liberal backbenchers with respect to this legislation when they cannot stay around this House. There are 94 Liberal members and they cannot stay around this House. You wonder what they are doing over in the whips' lounge. Perhaps enjoying the refreshments provided? Are those refreshments provided at the taxpayers' expense? Perhaps we should put a question on the Orders and Notices paper. In any event, they are not in this House.

I have talked about a significant waste of taxpayers' dollars and no real concern on the part of Liberal members of this Legislature. I am talking about modest amounts. We talked about \$100 a day, which I guess in terms of this budget and the moneys the government spends is pretty modest. We looked at the \$100 per day tax-free that the Liberal members of the standing committee on general government were receiving for their appearance on that committee, and they did nothing. They made no contribution whatsoever.

They were simply there to act as rubber-stampers, as sheeplike followers of the member for London Centre, and that was their only role, their sole role. They were not there to listen. They were not there to act upon what they heard. They were not there to really empathize or care or be concerned about the kind of moving testimony we heard over those weeks of public hearings; not at all.

It is not uncommon, when they waste the taxpayers' dollars in a futile exercise like that, to see them not bothering to show up here in the House when they are also receiving a good sum of money from the taxpayers of this province. They are all assigned a certain amount of House duty. Where are they, Mr Speaker? I ask you. Where is the government whip? We are talking about government legislation here. They have a responsibility to be here, especially when we are talking about such an important piece of legislation, a piece of legislation that is going to impact on virtually all Ontarians. They cannot even muster a quorum. They cannot even have enough people in this House to maintain a quorum.

Mr Faubert: It is the quality of the speaker that drives them away. We know what drives them out of here.

Mr Runciman: I was starting to talk about the constitutionality, and again I was tying this into the irresponsibility of this government with respect to the of the taxpayers' moneys. We have heard questions in this House from myself and from the member for Welland-Thorold to the Minister of Financial Institutions, to the Premier and to the Attorney General as well about the constitutionality of this legislation, the fact that some very prominent individuals have expressed concern about the constitutionality and the financial implications for this province.

We have even had certain members of the insurance industry writing to the Minister of Financial Institutions asking for a referral of this legislation to the Court of Appeal for a quick judgement on its constitutionality to see if indeed it violates the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but the minister has refused to do that and he really has not offered any explanation that stands up to scrutiny. He said, "Look, we have our own legal opinions and we are comfortable with them."

I think it is incumbent upon the minister, when we are dealing with an issue of such significance, dealing with an issue that is going to place such financial liability upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of this province, to make those opinions available to the public. Up to this point, he has refused to do so. For the information of members of the House and for the public, we have been attempting over a period of many months now to secure those legal opinions, because what we are talking about is a potential liability falling upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of the province of hundreds of millions of dollars.

This minister is not prepared to refer this legislation to the Court of Appeal for a rather speedy judgement with respect to its constitutionality. He wants to get through the next election. When he has those legal opinions in his hot, little hands and is not prepared to make them available to us, one has to wonder what they say.

Today I am filing a freedom-of-information request, a request for access to records, to the Ministry of Financial Institutions for any and all legal opinions relating to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance, that have been prepared for or sought by the Ministry of Financial Institutions; any and all correspondence regarding any and all legal opinions relating to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of Bill 68; the names of any and all legal firms contacted by the Ministry of Financial Institutions relating to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of Bill 68.

I am forced by this government to file a freedom-of-information request to try to gain access to legal opinions on the constitutionality of the no-fault auto insurance legislation brought in by this government because the minister and his cronies along the front bench are not prepared to make that public on their own. We have to make an effort to force their hand to make sure that the public of Ontario is very much aware of what the real implications of this legislation are.

The fact is that this government wants to get through an election, wants to get over the hump of the next provincial election. That is all it really cares about. If indeed this is found unconstitutional at some point down the road, who is going to suffer? They are hoping in any event that they are going to be ensconced in another majority government with another four or five years ahead of them and can ride the waves of any discontent that may arise as a result of their failure with respect to this legislation.

I think that if we can gain access to those opinions, we are going to find out that even the government's own counsel is suggesting that there is some doubt about the constitutionality of Bill 68.

1610

I want to read into the record a letter from Gordon F. Henderson. Mr Henderson, as we have mentioned before, is a former partner of the current Attorney General of this province, the member for St George-St David. This was prepared at the request of the organization, Fair Action in Insurance Reform. The letter was addressed to Lawrence Mandel.

"Dear Sir:

"At your request, I have examined the proposed amendments to the Insurance Act with a view to their constitutionality.

"As an experienced constitutional litigator, it is not my practice to give unqualified opinions as to the constitutionality of any legislative proposal. However, I am able to say that I do see a good arguable case to support the view that the threshold proposed in section 231a(1) is unconstitutional. The threshold, both in purpose and effect, treats those with mental disability in a manner less favourable than those with physical disability. Furthermore, the threshold can be construed as making an arbitrary distinction between mental disability that results from physical injury and that which does not. Finally, the threshold is set so high that it excludes recovery in tort for all but death and permanent serious injury, thereby discriminating against those with less serious injuries.

"In my view, there is a sufficient basis for constitutional objection under section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to require the government to justify the proposed amendments under section 1 of the charter. The ability of the government to do so may well be impeded by the findings and conclusions of reports earlier commissioned by the government into this subject.

"I have developed these observations more fully in a formal opinion to be forwarded to you shortly. In that opinion, I address other possible arguments under section 7 of the charter, although the proposed amendments are in my view less assailable under that section than under section 15.

"Yours very truly,

"Gordon F. Henderson."

If Hansard requires that, I will pass it down, assuming it will be returned.

I think the implications of this are very serious indeed. The fact is that, as I have said, there have been a number of executives of various insurance companies in this province who have written to the minister asking him to refer this to the Court of Appeal; Bill Star is one who—the minister is shaking his head—went public with his request. We have had the Committee for Fair Action in Insurance Reform and a number of other individuals and organizations in the province who are clearly on record as questioning the constitutionality of this legislation.

The implications, Mr Speaker—I want to run this by you once more—are significant. If we get through an election and the minister is not forced to make his legal opinions public, if we do not have a referral to the Court of Appeal and we have a challenge—and we know we are going to have a challenge and it may take a year or two to get a final judgement—but if we find out, following that process, that this legislation is unconstitutional, the result is going to be chaos.

There is going to be a significant liability, and where is that liability going to lie? We are talking about perhaps \$100 million to \$200 million—maybe more. That kind of a liability is going to lie on the shoulders of the taxpayers of this province because we have had the insurance industry already indicate some concern about the constitutionality. They want to cover their tails. We have had many others already make their submissions to the government clearly indicating before passage of this legislation that it should be referred to the Court of Appeal, and the government is refusing to do so.

So the insurance industry, counsellors, the FAIR organization and a number of others have clearly gone on record as expressing concern. I think the ultimate outcome of this, if indeed it is found unconstitutional after a year or two, could be very dramatic indeed for the taxpayers of Ontario.

Mr Cousens: Why will they not do anything about it?

Mr Runciman: One of my colleagues asked why they will not do anything about it. That is a very good question. It is one that is difficult to understand and fathom the reasoning of the minister and of the government as to why they will not make those opinions public. One can only speculate that those opinions are not as positive as one might hope in respect to the government's position. I suspect there is some doubt raised in the government's own opinions in respect to the constitutionality of this legislation.

We are continuing to get calls to my office. This one is from Matt Napier of Windsor. We are getting calls from around the province, as the member for Welland-Thorold did as well, calling to say, "Keep up the good work against Bill 68."

We have Eva Landry from Essex county. Who is the member for Essex county? That is Essex South, I gather—the Minister of Revenue. To Eva Landry in Essex county, I wonder if you have approached your own member, the member for Essex South, and had a chat with him in respect to this legislation. She has just returned from British Columbia and she says: "We don't want Bill 68 passed. Please keep up the blockade." Her

husband has a few choice words for Bill 68 which are best left to the imagination.

Mr Kormos: Go ahead, Bob, tell us. We want to know. What did the man say? Please, Bob, tell us. We want you to tell the Premier at the very least. Can you give us a clue? Give us the first letter of each word.

Mr Runciman: I cannot. Despite the pleas of the member for Welland-Thorold, I do not think it would be appropriate. I have already apologized on at least one occasion for using unparliamentary language.

Mr Kormos: When you called Brad Nixon a son of a gun? Well, he was.

Interjections.

Mr Runciman: Ain't this fun?

I want to talk about a few other things. I have lots of time here today. It is only 4:15. Boy oh boy, who knows how much time I have? I want to put a few extra things on the record. Here are some more messages which I probably should put on the record as well. Tracy Martin from Barrie, who gives us her phone number, says, "Keep fighting." Tom David: "We're behind you all the way." Beverley Medland from Pickering—who would her member be? Durham West, yes. I wonder, Bev Medland from Pickering, do you know who your member is? Do you know what her position is on this legislation? Do you know if she has even said one word on this legislation?

Mr Kormos: Okay, well done. Not Norah Stoner?

Mr Runciman: Mrs Stoner is indeed the member. I would suggest to Bev Medland in Pickering that you get on the phone and call your member and ask her what she is doing about this legislation. Is she concerned that there is going to be a net loss in benefits of 47.7%? Does your member care about that, Bev? Give her a call and ask her if she cares about that loss of benefits of close to 50%. Does she care about the fact that close to 95% or 97% of innocent accident victims in this province are not going to any longer, if this legislation passes, have the right to take an at-fault driver to court? Beverley, phone your member, the member for Durham West, and ask her what she is doing about it. Ask her if she is speaking up on this legislation. Ask her if she has said one word on this. Ask her if she has any concern for the future innocent accident victims in this province. Get on the phone, Beverley. Give her a call right now. She needs to hear from you.

Now we have Michael Kasaba of Toronto. There is no indication of Michael's riding here, but obviously the odds are, given the tendencies of Torontonians in the last provincial election, that it is a Liberal member, because certainly it is not a Conservative member. We do not hold a seat in Metropolitan Toronto and I think only a couple of New Democrats hold seats in the Metro Toronto area. But that is going to change in respect, probably, to both parties. It has to change if people are concerned about this kind of legislation. If they want to see it pulled back, if they want to see it changed, they have to do something in the next provincial election.

So Michael Kasaba of Toronto, if you are watching and listening, find out who your member is. The odds are that it is a Liberal and the odds are that he or she has not said a word on this legislation, does not really give a whit. All they care about is keeping their seats warm, drawing their salaries and hopefully getting a promotion at some point in the future, with the prospect of a limousine with a driver and an expense account with no limitation, all paid for by the taxpayers of this province.

That is what they are all hoping for. That is what they are all concerned about.

They are not concerned about innocent accident victims in this province. If they were, we would hear them speaking up. They cannot even maintain a quorum in this House, that is how much they care.

Interjections.

1620

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): We had it all in hand, I thought. We got the honourable member for Welland-Thorold to be quiet; now we have to recognize the honourable member for Willowdale.

Mr Matrundola: Correct. Thank you. On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe very much that when someone is speaking, we should listen to what the member is saying without interfering. With all due respect, I like the member for Welland-Thorold very much, but I do not think he has any business interrupting the honourable speaker, the member for Leeds-Grenville. Therefore, if we all try to listen when one of our colleagues is speaking, we can all gain and not lose.

Mrs Marland: Well, you could all come in.

Mr Matrundola: The member for Mississauga South should not interfere either. Therefore, if we respect each other we will achieve a lot more in this House.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I like the member for Willowdale as much as he likes me, but I will tell you this, if we could have unanimous consent to return the floor to me, I would be pleased to have unanimous consent to regain the floor so that I could carry on where I left off.

The Acting Speaker: I only want to bring it to the attention of the honourable government House leader who started this squabble.

Mr Wildman: Mr Speaker, I am sure you are going to rule that the point of order that was raised by the member for Willowdale really does not have a lot to do with who likes whom but has more to do with the question of interjections. I am sure you are going to say that interjections, according to the rules, are out of order, but we all realize in this House that they are quite traditional.

Mr Kormos: And they make good reading in the transcripts.

The Acting Speaker: I say to the honourable member for Algoma: exactly.

Mr Runciman: I appreciate these points of order.

I want to comment. The member for Willowdale got up, and when he gets up I guess it gives me an opportunity to comment about some of the calls I have received from the Willowdale riding. I would like the member to get up perhaps on a point of order or a question of privilege, whatever he wants to do, because certainly his government House leader is not going to give him an opportunity to speak on this legislation even if he wanted one, and that is highly unlikely, I suspect.

I think it would be of interest to the residents of Willowdale, certainly those who have called my office and expressed concern about no-fault legislation being brought in by this government, the fact that they are going to see a significant loss in benefits, the fact that they are going to lose the right to take an at-fault driver to court, the fact that anyone under 16 is not

going to have any access to no-fault benefits, a whole host of concerns that people in his own riding have.

We have not seen this member make any public statements that I am aware of. We have not heard him speak out in respect to this legislation. But he is here today and I will compliment him for at least being here and apparently paying some attention to the debate. But at some point, if he has concerns—and he should have concerns if he has looked at this legislation and its implications—I would love to see him get up and say so in this House. I encourage him to do so, even if he has to do it on a point of order or a question of privilege.

I think there is enough latitude in here, thanks to the office of the Speaker, that we can certainly have a minute or so to hear a point of order or a question of privilege. It will give him an opportunity to put his views on the record so that his constituents know that yes, indeed, he is concerned and that he is fighting on their behalf in respect to the very serious shortcomings of this legislation. I encourage the member for Willowdale to stand up and be counted on this legislation. Let's hear from him before the afternoon is over. The member should stand up and take a stand.

Mr Matrundola: Mr Speaker, if you would ask the member for Leeds-Grenville to stop arguing uselessly I will ask for permission to make comments on this legislation. If you will grant me that opportunity I will be glad to, but I will only do so after he is finished.

Mr Wildman: Is it not the case that we are debating the time allocation, not the bill?

Mr Runciman: I want to put on the record a few items here. This was the document provided me by—I am not sure who, but it certainly has a lot of relevant quotes and points that should be put on the record. I am quoting people and, again, I can make this available to Hansard, if it so desires.

This was from the Attorney General, the member for St George-St David, and it was reported in the Lawyers Weekly of 1 December 1989. Mr Scott explained that he perfectly understands lawyers' objections to the bill. He even acknowledged that "the new policy will provide worse coverage than the standard auto policy under the present tort no-fault system."

Mr Kormos: The Attorney General said that?

Mr Runciman: The Attorney General is on the record saying that this policy, this program brought in by the Liberal government, will provide worse coverage than the standard policy now available. The Attorney General is publicly admitting that.

Mr Wiseman: Why didn't he speak out like that in the House?

Mr Kormos: His is the best legal mind the Liberals can come up with.

The Acting Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Welland-Thorold told me he was going to go for a walk in the park and buy a hot dog. I was sort of half hoping he might do that.

Mr Keyes: I'll give him the three bucks.

Mr Kormos: But I heard the voice of the member for Willowdale as I was leaving the chamber and I felt compelled to return. I did not want to miss anything. If the Liberals would just withdraw this crummy time allocation motion, we could carry on with the real debate about Bill 68.

Mr Runciman: This is another quote and this one is from Ralph Nader, perhaps the foremost consumer advocate in North America, if not the world, and someone who was dumped upon by the Minister of Financial Institutions, who accused him of having some nerve coming up from the United States to talk about no-fault auto insurance. That was the minister's response. I want to say all of us on this side of the House, with perhaps the exception of the Liberal rump, have a great deal of respect for the record of Mr Nader and the views he offered to the committee. This is Mr Nader's quote: "Ontario's no-fault insurance plan is the most draconian system in North America." That was in the *Financial Post*, 6 December 1989.

Here is one from the *Toronto Sun*, in an editorial 3 December 1989: "The Peterson government wants to force threshold no-fault insurance on us when three costly studies recommended against it. What's going on? Are the Liberals so desperate to honour a foolish promise they'll stuff anything down our throats?" That is from the *Toronto Sun*.

This one is from Jack Carr, professor of economics at the University of Toronto. This is taken from the *Globe and Mail*, 8 January 1990: "The government also contends the plan will reduce legal fees and cost less to administer, but if it feels legal fees are the problem it should regulate the fees, rather than reduce benefits. Of course, the fees are not the problem. An Ontario Automobile Insurance Board commission appointed by the government to investigate no-fault systems concluded, 'It is extremely important that the government be aware that any cost-saving forecasts arise almost entirely from a reduction in benefits payable to injured claimants, rather than as a result of any increase in efficiency.' The essence of the proposed plan is to provide much less insurance coverage for a little more money. Selling half a loaf of bread at the same price is, in effect, a doubling in price and the province is hoping that consumers don't realize they are about to receive half a loaf of insurance coverage."

1630

Is that not true, Mr Speaker? The government has developed its propaganda line. They are simply talking about the increased no-fault benefits and they are not talking about the significant loss of rights and benefits on the other side of the equation. The net loss in benefits is 47.7%, brought home clearly by the government's own actuaries—47.7% net loss in benefits, but the government does not want to talk about that. Obviously they do not want to talk about that, they want to talk about the modest improvement to the no-fault side and just simply ignore it as if it is not there, and the sheep in the back benches are following the government line, with no objections whatsoever, apparently.

Another element is, what has the government said in response to the criticism it has received? I will go through these by number, Mr Speaker.

1. The guaranteed no-fault benefits will be higher than under the existing scheme.

That is good, no one opposes that, but it is not surprising, since they have not been adjusted since 1978. The benefits should obviously be raised, but this can be done under the old system, as recommended by Mr Justice Coulter Osborne.

2. If consumers wish to be able to collect more than \$600 a week of lost income if injured by a car, they can purchase extra insurance.

The government talks of keeping down car insurance premiums but has not told us anything about what it will cost us in extra premiums for separate accident insurance to replace

what the law is taking away. It is one thing for a negligent driver to have to rely on private insurance to replace lost income, but why should an innocent person, Mr Speaker, I ask you, have to take out an extra policy to recover her lost income? What if they cannot afford the extra insurance? That is something the government does not want to discuss. What if they simply cannot afford that extra insurance? Again, as I said on numerous occasions, again it impacts on those less fortunate in society, those who can ill afford this sort of thing. That is what is going to occur with this Liberal no-fault legislation.

The Liberal government says the payments will be paid more quickly under this new scheme. That is one of the things the minister is always harping on about. Mr Justice Coulter Osborne, in his study, commented on this very subject and the judge questioned the sense of unreality or lack of reality surrounding this legislation. The impression left by the government publicity machine is that everybody is going to get a stream of money flowing into his or her pockets if he is injured in an automobile accident. Mr Justice Osborne says it just will not happen, because auto insurers are second payers, and accordingly people will first have to rely on their collateral source benefits, such as long-term and short-term disability, before they collect no-fault benefits.

I have just had another message passed in to me. Pete and Janice Heisey of Toronto sent me a message: "Keep up the good work. My family resides in Ron Kanter's riding"—that is St Andrew-St Patrick. "I have written to Mr Kanter and called his riding office to express my disgust over this legislation. I have received a totally inadequate form letter in reply."

A form letter from the member for St Andrew-St Patrick, a Liberal member, and we have Peter and Janice Heisey, and many others, I suspect, in that member's riding, expressing concern, and he has prepared a form letter, probably prepared by the Ministry of Financial Institutions. "If anybody writes us, if anybody calls us, this is the pat answer; this is the government line. Just dish that out to them, like pap to the public. They don't understand this and we'll just try and get through this thing, we'll just try and sneak past the next election, and hopefully a lot of people out there will not notice what is happening." They will not notice how harmful this legislation is going to be to the people of this province, how negatively it impacts upon innocent accident victims, how severely it restricts access to the courts and their ability to take at-fault drivers to court.

The member for St Andrew-St Patrick and all of his other cronies in the Liberal party are trying to pull a quick one, trying to pull the wool over the voters' eyes, as their leader did in 1987, when he said he had a very specific plan to lower automobile insurance rates in this province and he had no such plan. He had no such plan, and indeed his promise, his irresponsible promise, has cost us all millions and millions and millions of dollars.

I do not think that particular gentleman could even tell the truth in his own diary. That is a reality, Mr Speaker, when you look at what he said and what has transpired over the past two and a half years. There are certain words I cannot use in this assembly. I have said them outside the House, but I respect this institution, I am not going to say them in this assembly. But there are very accurate words to describe the way in which the leader of the Liberal Party acted in 1987 when he made that very specific promise, which he has failed miserably to keep, and at the expense of taxpayers, the expense of millions and millions and millions of dollars, and ultimately at the expense and the future of innocent accident victims in this province. That is a reality, and this baggage has to be dumped at the feet

of the leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario, the member for London Centre.

I think that is indicative, I suspect, of the kinds of responses that people living and residing in the 94 ridings held by Liberal members are getting from their members: form letters, refusals to answer or return phone calls and refusals to deal in any meaningful way with this legislation and its very real imperfections. I can only express my sympathy to Peter and Janice Heisey, who are supposedly being represented by a Liberal member, but he certainly is not doing the job on this issue, perhaps the most important issue facing this Legislature in the past couple of years.

The government recognizes that by its placement of this on the agenda day after day after day. They recognize the importance of it, but they simply want to shove this away as quickly as they can, quickly as they can, without giving their own people, the people who put them in office, an opportunity to understand the implications, or if indeed they do have some concerns, simply not to explain, not to get back to them, not to try to appreciate those concerns, and certainly not to speak about them in this Legislature, not to speak about them in committee, not to express any concern, none whatsoever.

We have not heard one peep in committee or in this House. All of these Liberal members, whenever we can have a quorum in this place with Liberal members, whenever they do speak up, it is either on a point of order with some foolish point of order or some rather inane interjection, some criticism of the members of the opposition who are trying to put on the record the concerns of the hundreds of people who appeared before us in committee and the thousands who have written to all of us as members.

They are certainly not being heard because of those members over there. With the few members in opposition, the responsibility for getting the message out has fallen completely on the shoulders of the New Democratic Party and the Progressive Conservative Party, 19 members and 17 members respectively.

Mr Sterling: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I just want the member for Leeds-Grenville to be accurate in his criticism of the Liberals. I think he should know that the former MPP for Ottawa East, Albert Roy, has definitely stated his opposition to this legislation. Now he is not a Liberal who is in power, but he is a Liberal who is against—

Some hon members: Not a point of order.

The Acting Speaker: As well pointed out by my learned colleagues, mostly to my right, it was not a point of order.

Mr Runciman: I appreciate that interjection. The former member from Ottawa, Mr Roy, and a significant number of other Liberals across this province are expressing concern about this legislation.

I talked about this at length in days past, about the fact that the government House leader is experiencing some difficulty in his own riding as a result of his refusal to take a tough stand on this legislation, as is the member for Hamilton Centre. The member for Sudbury has his own riding executive expressing concern about this, which he scoffed at and said, "Who are those folks to tell me what to do?" We have a whole host of members of the Liberal Party who are upset about this grass-roots level, and it is going to come home to roost with a number of the incumbents across the floor.

There are some Liberals out there who care. I am not going to say there are not.

In terms of this Legislature, we have 94 of them in this House, the largest majority in the history of Ontario, and not one of those 94 Liberal members has spoken out in criticism of this legislation or has suggested any meaningful changes which will improve the lot of innocent accident victims in this province for the future. That is the reality. It is a sad reality indeed, but it is there for all of us to reflect upon, and certainly for the voters of this province to reflect upon when we next go to the polls.

1640

Another government contention is that it says good drivers will not be subsidizing bad drivers because fault will continue to be a key factor in setting premiums. That is what is called a half-truth. Good drivers will subsidize bad drivers by being forced to pay extra for private disability insurance to replace what the bad driver must pay under the present law if sued. Also, all innocent accident victims, including pedestrians, will subsidize bad drivers by giving up existing rights to compensation.

As Justice Osborne put it in his report to the government, "Cost premium decreases would be modest were we to proceed to threshold no-fault and those modest cost savings would be imported on the backs of over 90 per cent of injured Ontario motorists, who now have the right to seek non-economic compensation."

We have a comment from the MPP for Scarborough-Agincourt, who said publicly, "The bill will benefit the majority of motorists and accident victims in the future." As a general statement, that is totally inaccurate. No-fault benefits will be higher, but most victims will be worse off than under the present system because they will lose court damages which are greater.

The truth is that no one will receive more total compensation under the new plan except those who could not prove fault in court. We are talking about mainly negligent drivers, and 90% to 95%, perhaps 97% of all innocent victims will receive less and 3% to 5% of innocent victims will receive the same. Them's the facts, if the parliamentary assistant wants to acknowledge them.

We are talking about rate changes. The Minister of Financial Institutions has said that maintaining the status quo would result in an average premium increase of 30% to 35% and improvements to the no-fault benefits, which we all agree are desirable, will boost rates a further 5 to 10 points. He was quoted as saying that in the *Globe and Mail* in January 1990.

If the right to sue were retained, there would be a jump in premiums, because the government has kept them from rising with costs for three years. However, the estimate of a 30% jump must be reduced by the \$143 million the government has decided to give insurance companies as a subsidy, and the cost jump will also be smaller because of significant tort reform, reforms to damage law, enacted just before Christmas. Against the immediate rise must be compared the extra cost of private insurance to replace the protection lost when the right to sue is taken away.

The most significant factor is the long term. Both Justice Osborne and the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board concluded that, after the initial rise, the future cost increase of the old and new systems would be the same.

I want to talk briefly about a number of areas, but I want to get on to more detail about the leader of the Liberal Party, because ultimately he is the one who is responsible for this legislation because of the promise he made in 1987. I think all of us in opposition have to make an effort, as best we can, to

ensure that the public is aware of just who is responsible for this, so I am going to discuss the role of the future Leader of the Opposition and the current Premier of this province in detail. I appreciate your patience, Mr Speaker.

Okay. We are talking about the member for London Centre and the fact that he made his promise in 1987. I have talked about his lack of empathy with the less fortunate in society, and I am not going to go into that at length again today—his Rosedale mansion and the plush life that that gentleman lives and has lived all of his life. He has never really had to worry about having any calluses on his hands. As we all know, he spent the early part of his adult life, up until his late twenties, going to a variety of schools in this country and in Europe and then went into his father's firm as president of the company—a real tough struggle up the ladder—and then, a year later, he became a member of this Legislature.

I guess I have always had some trouble with the myth that has been built up by the Liberal propaganda machine in respect to the Premier's business credentials. I have always had some difficulty with that, and I think that if you take a look at the comments of the leader of the business organization, and I am trying to think of his name, the most prominent business organizer—

Mr Sterling: John Bulloch?

Mr Runciman: —John Bulloch of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, who said that Mr Peterson's government, the Liberal government of Ontario, is the most antibusiness government in Canada, I think that speaks volumes about the business experience of the leader of the Liberal Party and his understanding of business. Of course, we have seen all sorts of initiatives undertaken by this Liberal government which are damaging to industry and business in this province and ultimately damaging to the economy and, again, to all of us as residents and taxpayers of this province.

I am going to talk a bit about abandoning Liberal principles. The Globe and Mail, on 27 June 1985—this was the leader of the Liberal Party addressing people on the swearing-in of his government—said: "You will have the most important role to play. You are helping to symbolize the kind of government to which Ontario is entitled, a government without walls or barriers."

Let us talk about the facts in that one. He has created insurmountable walls for the injured victims who can only go to court if they meet the toughest threshold anywhere. He withheld information from the Legislature, the actuarial studies, and endeavoured to close down debate on this issue. We can talk about that, the fact that we had 39 actuarial studies dumped on our lap the last day of public hearings, and when I attempted to have an expert witness testify for 15 minutes, we had another effort to cut off that input and that debate. That is the reality.

Hon Mr Elston: Expert?

Mr Runciman: The minister can interject, but that is the reality. We had those reports dumped on our lap the last day of public hearings, an effort to have Professor Jack Carr critically comment for 15 minutes and an effort made by the member for York Mills to cut off that debate.

The minister can shake his head, but he was not there. He was not there during those hearings. I can only recall him being there for the opening day, so if he wants to talk about what occurred in that committee, I think he is poorly qualified to do so.

I move adjournment of the House.

1718

The House divided on Mr Runciman's motion, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 15; nays 51.

The Deputy Speaker: Minister.

Hon Mr Elston: Since nobody else has taken the floor, I rise now to participate in the debate. It is a pleasure to—

The Deputy Speaker: No. Order, please.

Hon Mr Elston: Nobody stood up.

The Deputy Speaker: I thought you were rising on a point of order. Apologies if you got a mixed message, but the floor belongs to the member for Leeds-Grenville.

Mr Runciman: Mr Speaker, you talk about sleazy moves, that is a sleazy move.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: I hope the members of that gentleman's riding will remember, when he asks them to vote for him and for good government, he is asking them to vote twice. That is the reality. I want to talk about what this gentleman tried to do here today. It is indicative of the way the government has treated this issue from day one, wanting to cut off meaningful debate, wanting to limit the opportunities of Ontarians to be heard on this issue.

Interjections.

Mr Kormos: Throw the Liberals out, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, please. The member for Leeds-Grenville will address the debate.

Mr Runciman: What the Liberal government is really doing here is sapping the foundations of democracy. That is the reality. You know, Mr Speaker, if we take a look at what has happened, take a look at what has transpired in the course of this debate, the fact that we had to force them to have public hearings—and they were very limited indeed, to four municipalities across the province. And then what happened? We had witness after witness appear before us and they were totally ignored or insulted by the Liberal members who served on that committee.

Then we had important reports, relevant reports, reports that told us what this process was going to cost us, how many people were going to be hurt by it, excluded by it. And what did they do with those? They hid them from the committee until the very last day of public hearings and then they restricted opportunity for critical scrutiny of those 39 very detailed and involved actuarial studies which the government restricted us from having access to until the very last day of public hearings.

Then, when we had rate filings on no-fault auto insurance in December 1989, full rate filings in January 1990, during the committee hearings process, they failed again to make that information available to the committee, very relevant information. I had to file freedom-of-information applications for both those actuarial studies before they would make them available to the committee on the last day of the committee. I had to file freedom-of-information applications for the rate filings.

I think the words I used to describe the actions of the minister here today were very accurate indeed, and they describe the way the government has dealt with this issue from day one—

not only sleazy, but the height of incompetence—and we are all going to pay for it.

Mr Philip: It's a good thing you've got the NDP to back you up, Bob.

Mr Runciman: That is pretty scary, actually.

I will just keep forging ahead. During the break we did have some messages come into my office, another bundle of messages. They are coming fast and furiously, support out there urging us to carry on.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Would the members please respect the standing orders.

Mr Runciman: I think it is relevant, given the actions of the Minister of Financial Institutions here this afternoon, his effort to further curtail debate, to cut us off here today, to pull the rug out from under us. I am into my fourth or fifth hour of this debate. I want to say that what they have done. There are 39 members of the opposition and the government has limited input into this debate to two members essentially, the member for Welland-Thorold and the member for Leeds-Grenville. They have done that, they have cut it off, they brought in time allocation.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: They brought in this bill, and once the floor goes to them we know what is going to happen. They are going to move the previous question.

Mr Kormos: Disdain for the voters of Ontario.

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: Did you hear what he said? Call an election.

The Deputy Speaker: Would the member for Welland-Thorold please contain himself.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: The invitation is addressed to all other members also. Control yourselves.

Mr Runciman: This is a letter from the provincial riding of Eglinton, from a gentleman by the name of Mark Elkin. A Ms Poole represents that riding. Have we seen her around? Does anyone know where she is? Is she here today? Will someone answer that question? Is the member for Eglinton participating in this debate? I want to say that we know she is a Liberal.

Mark Elkin, who lives in that riding, met with the member three or four years ago and she said at that time that she was against no-fault. Mark Elkin should be on the phone today, phoning the member for Eglinton and asking her to explain why this flip-flop, why this turnaround, why four years ago was she opposed to no-fault and now she thinks it is hunky-dory, this is great news for Ontario.

Obviously ambition is colouring that lady's judgement as well. I want to urge Mark Elkin and any other resident of that riding to call the member, call her and talk to her about this legislation, talk to her about the imperfections, the failings of this legislation, the fact that you cannot agree with legislation that is going to result in the net loss of benefits of 47.7%, is going to result in a \$1-billion windfall to the insurance industry, is going to result in 95% to 97% of innocent accident victims in

this province being restricted from having the ability to take an at-fault driver to court. Give her a call and tell her. Get on that phone right now and give her a call. Let her know how you feel, let her know you want her to stand up and speak out on your behalf. Let her know.

1730

I have another one here, from a Doug Welland who "wants Bob to delay the legislation." He is an economist and he is saying the threshold is far too low. I do not know what Doug's riding is—it is not indicated here—but I will encourage Doug to find out who his member is. Given the odds, with a massive majority Liberal government, 94 Liberal members of this Legislature, and only 39 opposition members—and the 94 Liberals do not want to give us our day in court. They do not want us, Her Majesty's loyal opposition, to have an opportunity to express the concerns of thousands and thousands of people across this province. They want to cut off debate. They want to shortchange these people, especially, and most important, innocent accident victims in this province in the future if this legislation goes through.

Thank you, Doug. I appreciate hearing from you.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: Here is one from a Conservative riding, a gentleman by the name of Richard Newman. He is from the riding of Durham East. He is very proud of the stand his member is taking, very proud of the member for Durham East. Unfortunately, the member is not in the chair. This gentleman quit driving a cab because of loss of benefits and he thinks that Bill 68 is going to be the most serious disaster to drivers in this province in the history of the province. I cannot get this message too clearly, but in any event, Richard Newman from the riding of Durham East is indicating his support for the stand that the Conservatives and the NDP are taking on this issue.

There are some Liberal members representing other Durham ridings and I would encourage Richard to call the other members representing Durham ridings and talk to his friends, neighbours and relatives, who may contact those Liberal representatives and urge them to take a look at this legislation, this law, and indicate their strong objection to it.

We have Michael Babcock who is in the riding of St George-St David. He totally supports the objections of the opposition, and this is most relevant. He is a former resident of Michigan, which has a system somewhat comparable but significantly much less onerous—

Mr Kormos: More generous.

Mr Runciman: —a much more generous no-fault program. But their system was a failure, a waste of taxpayers' money. He simply does not want us to proceed with this no-fault plan: "Ontario residents better wake up and phone their members to stop this."

Mr Kormos: But the Liberals won't listen.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, please.

Mr Runciman: Thank you, Michael, and I hope you are contacting the Attorney General, your provincial member, who has himself said that this is going to provide worse benefits to drivers in this province than they currently have. I encourage that gentleman to phone his Liberal member.

Here is one from the riding of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I am trying to find the riding of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I know he is in here somewhere.

An hon member: York Centre.

Mr Runciman: York Centre? Thanks very much for the assistance. Patricia Frank, from the riding of York Centre: "Fully supporting the stand of the opposition. Appalled by no-fault and the lack of Liberal concern for the welfare of the citizens of this province."

How right you are, Patricia Frank. There is certainly no concern in the back benches of this government, no concern whatsoever. We understand, to some degree, the principle of cabinet solidarity. We can recognize that. We can appreciate it. This was dealt with by cabinet and passed by cabinet. But when we look at the question of the 80-some Liberal backbenchers who are remaining quiet on this, who are simply pumping out the Liberal propaganda line, not answering their phone calls, not dealing in a meaningful way with the real and legitimate concerns of many, many people across this province, they are the people whom we have to get after, whom their various ridings have to get after to change their attitude, change their approach, take a fresh look at this and realize what damage this legislation is going to do to many, many innocent people right across this province.

Mr Kormos: They have been bought off with campaign contributions.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, please.

Mr Runciman: I am going to get back to these messages. I want to briefly mention a petition which my colleague the member for Markham has not had an opportunity to table in the House. But, as members of the Legislature and viewers can see, this petition has a significant number of names on it, all in opposition to what the government calls the Ontario motorist protection plan, Bill 68, no-fault auto insurance, all of these people in the Markham riding so well represented by my colleague the member for Markham.

During the brief time we had a committee of the whole House in this Legislature, the member for Markham intervened in a most significant way because he cares about the people in his riding who are going to suffer under this legislation. Taking a look at the broader picture, the member for Markham is very much concerned about how this is going to impact on innocent accident victims in the province in the future, the people who are going to suffer because of this Liberal bill, which is going to benefit whom? Whom is this bill going to benefit? I ask you that, Mr Speaker.

Take a look at the testimony before the committee. The only people who supported this legislation were from the insurance industry or affiliated with the insurance industry. That is the reality. We had consumers, we had advocates for the head-injured, we had advocates for individuals suffering from psychological trauma as a result of auto accidents, we had all kinds of private individuals who appeared before us in Sudbury, in Thunder Bay, in Windsor and in Toronto. They were ignored.

But the minority who appeared before us, the people who have a vested interest in this, who stand to gain, the 10% or even perhaps only 5% of the witnesses supportive of this legislation—one has to stop and wonder what this is all about. Why is the government doing this? Who stands to gain? The message

is there. It is very clear for anyone who wants to take a look at what has transpired over the past year and a half.

Again, I want to commend the member for Markham and I hope he will continue his efforts on behalf of not only the residents of his riding but all the people of Ontario who are going to suffer as a result of this legislation. I thank him very much.

Getting back briefly to some of the messages I have been receiving, this is Linda Thomas from Pickering—I do not know who represents the Pickering area—very strongly in support of the Conservative stand. Bob Cash called and he is a long-time supporter of our party and wants to delay the legislation as long as possible. We are getting a lot of letters.

Interjection.

Mr Runciman: The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere is again making his usual contribution. I want to say we are getting a lot of interventions here from grass-roots Liberals who are very concerned. Perhaps those people should take a look at the nomination meeting in that gentleman's riding and take a look at the meaningful contribution he has made during this debate.

I want to say that people who come into this Legislature when we are talking about such a serious issue as this—we are talking about an issue that is going to impact on thousands and thousands, indeed millions, of people in this province in a negative way: innocent accident victims, the head-injured, people suffering from psychological traumas as a result of auto accidents, the poor, the less fortunate in society, the multitudes of people who are going to be negatively impacted upon by this legislation—we have members like the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere coming in here and what they are doing in reality is insulting all of those people—

Mr Faubert: You can't even say that with a straight face.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Runciman: —insulting all these people who are going to be hurt by this legislation, people who have expressed concern about this legislation, who have appeared before committee wanting to be heard, wanting the Liberal government to pay heed to their concerns.

It has not happened. All we get is this kind of continual garbage from Liberal backbenchers, interjections which are meaningless, useless and make no meaningful impact. They do not want to stand up and be counted on this issue. All they want to do is interfere, obstruct, cut off debate, not give the opposition a meaningful opportunity. That is their total commitment in this House.

1740

Mr Kormos: The Liberals have been bought off by the insurance companies.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Interjection.

Mr Pouliot: Humour doesn't become you, Faubert, so don't attempt it.

The Deputy Speaker: Le député de Lac Nipigon, s'il vous plaît, and the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere also.

Mr Faubert: He is not in his seat. I am in my seat.

Mr Philip: You are always in your seat. We have never seen you on the floor.

Mr Cousens: All he is doing is trying to interrupt and interfere. There is no way you are participating in it, Frank. You are just being objectionable.

The Deputy Speaker: Are the members finished? The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, the member for Markham and the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere. I am calling all members to order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: What about that invitation you had for us?

The Deputy Speaker: The invitation still stands. The member for Leeds-Grenville, please.

Mr Runciman: We in Her Majesty's loyal opposition have respect for this assembly. We have respect for this place and the institutions of this place, unlike the Liberal government. In their efforts to undermine the opposition, to cut us off in respect to meaningful debate, to limit this debate essentially to two members of the opposition, when they made this arrogant move to cut off committee of the whole and restrict it to two days, Mr Speaker, as I have said—and you may think it is an assault and perhaps extreme language—but when I said earlier, “sapping the foundations of democracy,” I think if you take a look at precedents in respect to time allocation or closure you will find indeed that this is a first and a very sad first indeed with respect to the initiatives of this government and how quickly it moved to introduce time allocation and cut off debate.

I want to say that the needs, the rights and the interests of accident victims are taking a back seat to the political interests of the Liberal Party of Ontario. That is indeed the reality.

If we want to talk about it, we can look at what has happened from day one. We can look at the waste of money with Mr Justice Osborne and the fact that that report, the most comprehensive in North American history on the auto insurance question, was totally ignored. The government forged ahead with significant intervention in the private sector and wasted those millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars.

That has been an indicator. That was the early indicator of where this government was heading in respect to its ability to spend taxpayers' dollars with no meaningful or positive results for the taxpayers of the province.

I know my colleague the member for Welland-Thorold has talked about the significant contributions made by the insurance industry to Liberal members. I am not going to dwell on it at length but I think it is something I should raise.

When we take a look at the history of this, the Minister of Financial Institutions and his group of cronies cooked up this bad, bad deal for Ontarians behind closed doors at the same time that parallel hearings were going on by the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board, an assigned task by that minister which was in essence an effort at smoke and mirrors, an effort to confuse the public that indeed there was a full public airing of the question of threshold no-fault.

At the same time, the minister and his friends and colleagues, and we would like to know who they were, who came up with this plan behind closed doors, were designing this most onerous, nasty piece of business that is now Bill 68 before this House.

I do not think they could have come up with this bill without the full co-operation of the Insurance Bureau of Canada and their friends in the industry. We are a private, free enterprise party. We believe in the free enterprise system and we have had a great deal of difficulty, to say the least, with the stand of the insurance industry with respect to no-fault.

What we have even more difficulty with is the significant contributions made to Liberal members of the Legislature by various insurance companies. If we want to take a look at even the members who served on the committee, there were indications of contributions from the insurance industry. I am not going to say they were not in some cases modest, and hopefully they did not have any influence on what transpired. I do not know what total commitment was made to the Liberal Party right across the province by insurance companies, but I certainly hope that those kinds of contributions did not have an impact on the decision that led to Bill 68.

But you have to wonder, when you look again at who benefits from this legislation and who loses. Who are the winners and who are the losers? Clearly, the winners are the insurance industry in Ontario. Clearly, they are the winners, and the losers are the rest of us, the victims, auto accident victims in this province.

So when you try to fathom the rationale behind this legislation, you cannot help but come to the conclusion that a deal was done. A deal was done with the industry, and as much as that hurts me as a free-enterpriser, and it hurts me to think that that sort of thing might have happened, certainly one can come to no other conclusion.

Mr Kormos: The taxpayers lose, the victims lose, the drivers lose.

Mr Runciman: That is for sure. Going back to 1987, the member for London Centre, the leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario, made a promise which he failed to keep: a promise, a promise, a promise. In our party, a promise is a promise; a commitment is a commitment. We keep them, unlike the leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario, who has wasted millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars in this insurance fiasco from 1987.

But now he has brought in legislation which is harmful, harmful, harmful. It is going to hurt thousands upon thousands of innocent accident victims in this province, impact negatively upon the less fortunate in our society and exclude up to 97% of accident victims from taking the at-fault driver to court.

Those are the facts and we have not heard any arguments to the contrary. When the minister finally gets his opportunity to stand up on his feet here and try to explain it, what will we hear? The same old baloney. They are not going to deal with the fact that there is a 47.7% loss of benefits; he is not going to talk about that. He is going to talk about, “Well, we have increased the no-fault to \$600 a week.” Big deal. When you look at the fact that you are losing almost 50% of your benefits, he will have the gall to stand up here and talk about, “Well, we are increasing the no-fault benefits.”

Let's hear some justification, let's hear some rationale for cutting benefits to the people of this province by close to 50% with no reduction whatsoever in their rates. Let's hear him justify that. He will not deal with it. He will not talk to it. He will talk around it. He will try to muddy the waters. He will talk about the very modest improvements in the no-fault section. It is a game of smoke and mirrors. It is an insult to the taxpayers of this province.

It is not only an insult to the taxpayers. It is a dangerous piece of legislation which may take a couple of years to come back to haunt us, but it is indeed going to haunt us. When people start to get into accidents in this province and they find their no-fault coverage does not provide the kinds of benefits that they have grown accustomed to, boy oh boy, is the you-know-what going to hit the fan.

1750

But then the Liberals do not care. They are hoping that they are going to be ensconced with another majority government. They can put their heels up and say: "We can weather the storm for another two or three years. We can perhaps even nationalize the industry. Get us through another election. We will nationalize the industry." They do not give a damn about the private sector. They do not care about the private sector. They do not have principles. That is the reality. Their only principle is getting re-elected, doing whatever is necessary to soothe the electorate to get them through the next election. That is the reality.

The introduction of this legislation was a sad day for Ontario, a sad day indeed. It is something that is going to be harmful to all of us.

At this juncture, I want to introduce an amendment to the legislation. I am moving this amendment, that government motion 30 be amended by deleting the number "2" in the third line before the word "sessional" and substituting the number "8" thereto. I also move that government motion 30 be amended by deleting the word "second" in the seventh line after the words "at 5:45 pm on the" and the word "eighth" be substituted thereto. I have a number of copies of that which I will provide the Chair with.

I want to continue speaking to this. I have introduced this amendment. Again, it ties into the fact—

The Speaker: Order. The member has placed an amendment. Therefore, I would appreciate the opportunity to place it. That is according to the standing orders.

Mr Runciman moves that government motion 30 be amended by deleting the number "2" in the third line before the word "sessional" and substituting the number "8" thereto—it looks like two motions here—and that it also be amended by deleting the word "second" in the seventh line after the words "at 5:45 pm on the" and the word "eighth" be substituted therefor.

It appears to me to be in order.

Mr Runciman: Speaking on the amendment, the rationale behind this of course is what we have been talking about since the outset with respect to the government's efforts to curtail debate and to not provide the 39 members of the opposition with an opportunity to deal in a meaningful way with the important elements of this legislation.

I indicated and put on the record earlier today a number of amendments, which we wish to deal with in committee of the whole. The Liberal government has said to the 39 members of the opposition—

Interjection.

Mr Runciman: Thirty-six? There are only 36; even worse. I guess that was wishful thinking on my part. There are going to be a couple of by-elections coming up. The fact is there are only 36 members of the opposition and 94 Liberals and they want to shut off debate. They do not want the 36 opposition members to have an opportunity to talk about the very real concerns we have heard from thousands and thousands of people right across this province. They do not want to hear it. They do not want to listen.

When they have been forced to in this Legislature, because of the member for Welland-Thorold and the member for Leeds-Grenville, they do not pay any attention. We have trouble getting a quorum in here because Liberal members do not want to be here. They do not want to listen. They do not want to listen to their constituents when they are calling them day after day or

writing them, saying, "Look, we are concerned about the way this going to hurt us, hurt our friends and neighbours and families." They do not want to listen. They do not want to hear. They do not want to react. They do not want to stand up in this House and speak out on behalf of their own constituents. They do not have the intestinal fortitude to do it. They are not representing the people who put them in office in the first place, the people who elected them. They should be ashamed of themselves. They should be embarrassed.

We need this extra time. We are asking for eight days. We think that is a very modest request indeed. If you take a look at the history of time allocation being brought in—we can have the two House leaders perhaps talk about this at some point in the future; they have talked about it in the past—this is unprecedented legislation in its impact on curtailing input from Her Majesty's loyal opposition. It is unbelievable, when we have such an arrogant 94-member government—

Mr D. S. Cooke: Ninety-three.

Mr Runciman: Ninety-three, I am told, a 93-member Liberal government, an unbelievably arrogant group, 93 members who do not want the 36 opposition members to stand up. The 80-some Liberal backbenchers do not have the guts themselves to stand up and they do not want us to stand up. That is the reality. That is why I have moved this amendment, and it is going to be interesting to see the government's reaction. What is wrong with eight days in committee of the whole House? Tell me what is wrong with that. Nothing at all, Mr Speaker. You know that is quite common with legislation dealt with by this Legislature. It is quite common to have at least eight days.

But on this most important piece of legislation, this legislation that is going to hurt thousands and thousands of innocent accident victims in this province, the government says: "No, we're going to cut you off at two days. We're going to let two members of the opposition speak at length and the other 30-some are not going to have an opportunity. Give them a minute. Give them two minutes. Maybe we'll be really generous and give them three minutes." That is what the Liberal government is saying to the opposition, but more important, that is what the Liberal government is saying to innocent accident victims right across this province: "We'll give you three minutes to get your case, and we're not going to listen for that three minutes. We'll give you three, but we're not going to listen. We're not going to pay attention. Nuts on you, brother. We're the Liberal majority government of this province and we know what's best for you."

That is exemplified by the member for Sudbury. When his own Liberal riding association executive said, "This is bad," he said: "Who the hell are they to tell me that? Get out of my face. You don't have a right to tell me what to do. I'm an elected Liberal member. I'm holier than thou." That is the approach.

The arrogance starts on the front bench and it ripples right to the back, an arrogant bunch like this Legislature has never seen in its history. They should be ashamed, they should be embarrassed, but they are not. All they care about are the perks that go with the job, keeping their seats warm, collecting their paycheques on a regular basis and keeping in good favour with the member for London Centre. When they stand up and vote on this, they are all going to be bowing and licking the floor towards the member for London Centre, hoping upon hope that he is going to look at them and say, "Yes, you're a good fellow, you're a good gal, you supported me." It may mean at some point in the future a limousine with a driver, a limousine with a chauffeur, an unlimited expense account and plush offices, all at the taxpayers' expense.

At the same time, they are wasting millions and millions of dollars in this province. People are lining up at food banks across this province. They are wasting millions and hurting the people in this province who can least afford it, the unemployed, the poor, the people who cannot afford to buy extra insurance coverage, which they are going to have to have if they want to be adequately covered, because of this government's initiatives.

It is shameful indeed that we have been brought to this position by this Liberal government, this arrogant bunch of Liberals who do not really care. If they care, they are not showing it. If they care, they are hiding their feelings. Obviously some of them must understand the implications of this legislation, a few basic facts that I have been trying to talk about for the last four days.

Their own actuary says there is going to be a net loss in benefits of 47.7%. This is being brought in on the backs of innocent accident victims. Justice Coulter Osborne said that.

Their own Liberal—we will use a polite word—adviser, Mr Kruger, says again that if they bring in threshold no-fault and realizes any stability in rates, it is going to be done at the cost of benefits. You are going to lose benefits, but that does not seem to be getting through to the Liberal members.

What about this one? Ninety-five per cent to 97% of accident victims are going to lose the right to take an at-fault driver to court. They are going to lose that right. Does that get through to any Liberal members over there? Do any of them understand that? It is very basic. It is very simple. They are hurting people with this legislation and they are benefiting an already privileged sector in society. That is all they are doing. They are hurting people, and on the other side, benefiting a very privileged sector.

On motion by Mr Runciman, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1800.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS
(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaître, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling
Clerk: Douglas Arnott**Estimates**

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrondola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Harold Brown**Finance and economic affairs**

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft
Clerk: Lisa Freedman**General government**

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman
Clerk: Franco Carrozza**Government agencies**

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breagh, Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South
Clerk: Harold Brown**Legislative Assembly**

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breagh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan
Clerk: Deborah Deller**Ombudsman**

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock
Clerk: Franco Carrozza**Public accounts**

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Regulations and private bills**

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham
Clerk: Lisa Freedman**Resources development**

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman
Clerk: Lynn Mellor**Social development**

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner
Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breagh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts
Clerk: Deborah Deller**Education**

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Energy**

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray
Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Tuesday 8 May 1990

Members' statements

Workers' Compensation Board	1095
Mr Laughren	
Pollution control	1095
Mr Wiseman	
Election in Croatia	1095
Mr Faubert	
Waste management	1095
Mrs Grier	
Anniversary of mobilization of regiment	1096
Mr Villeneuve	
Election in Croatia	1096
Mr Sola	
Women's health services	1096
Mr Charlton	
Nurses' Week	1096
Mr Eves	
Kathleen Taylor	1096
Mr Adams	

Statements by the ministry

Cancer treatment	1097
Mrs Caplan	
Violence against women	1098
Mrs Wilson	
Property tax grants	1098
Mr Mancini	

Responses

Property tax grants	1098
Mr Laughren	
Cancer treatment	1098
Mr Reville	
Violence against women	1098
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Property tax grants	1099
Mr Brandt	
Violence against women	1099
Mr Jackson	
Cancer treatment	1099
Mr Eves	

Oral questions

Agricultural land	1099
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Sweeney	
Accessibility for the disabled	1100
Mrs Grier	
Mr Sweeney	
Mr Allen	

Economic outlook	1101
Mr Brandt	
Mr R. F. Nixon	
Children's mental health services	1102
Mr Brandt	
Mr Beer	
Corporate tax	1103
Mr Laughren	
Mr R. F. Nixon	
Ministry mailing	1103
Mr Jackson	
Mrs Wilson	
Investment in Ontario	1103
Ms Oddie Munro	
Mr Kwinter	
Pension legislation	1104
Mr Morin-Strom	
Mr Elston	
Labour dispute	1105
Mr Sterling	
Mr Conway	
Detroit incinerator	1105
Mr McGuigan	
Mr Bradley	
Social assistance	1105
Mr Allen	
Mr Beer	
Access to post-secondary education	1106
Mr Pope	
Mr Conway	
Decentralization of government operations	1107
Mr M. C. Ray	
Mr R. F. Nixon	

Petitions

Naturopathy	1107
Mr Mackenzie	
Greater Toronto area	1107
Mr Philip	
Drug benefits	1107
Mr Cordiano	
French-language school board	1107
Mr Poirier	
Water-play facility	1107
Mr Ballinger	
Licence plate fees	1107
Mr Ballinger	
Automobile insurance	1107
Mr Ballinger	
Employer health tax	1107
Mr Adams	

First readings	Other business
Environmental Protection Amendment Act, 1990,	Members' privileges 1097
Bill 165 1108	Ms Poole
Mr Allen	Mr McCague
Agreed to 1108	Adjournment 1124
Jabko Holdings Ltd Act, 1990, Bill Pr76 1108	
Mr Owen	Lists of members
Agreed to 1108	Members and their responsibilities 1125
	Committees of the Legislative Assembly 1128
Government motion	
Time allocation, motion 30 1108	
Mr Runciman 1108	
Adjourned 1124	

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mardi 8 mai 1990

Pétition

Conseil scolaire de langue française 1107
M. Poirier



31 90

31 90

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 9 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 9 mai 1990



Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 9 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

BRIDGE REPAIRS

Mr Allen: I have a very simple question for the Minister of Transportation: When on earth is the work on the McKittrick Bridge, provincial project 88-90, going to be completed? There are only two access routes from Hamilton below the Mountain to Hamilton West and really only one that is at all direct; it leads over the McKittrick Bridge, which overpasses Highway 403.

Some 14 months ago the ministry closed down two lanes for repairs. Today there are still only two lanes and it is a major bottleneck. The patience of Hamilton West drivers is exhausted and the regional engineering department is fed up with making excuses for the province. The bridge not only feeds Hamilton West but two ramps on to Highway 403, and the barriers and laning require some quick responses from drivers who may not be familiar with the route. It is surprising that there have been no accidents to date.

The failure of the province to complete the work has complicated regional planning for other road repairs in the area and aggravated drivers' reactions to other nearby repairs being proceeded with by the region. They are fed up with driving by what often appears to be abandoned machinery or a couple of workers looking forlornly at a non-functioning air compressor. How many more months do we have to wait for this bridge repair to be finished?

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Mr Jackson: The Watson commission report on religious education in Ontario's public school system has been in the hands of the Liberal government since January of this year and has yet to be made public.

This delay in releasing the report is unacceptable. It is unacceptable and unfair to ecumenical educators, such as Archbishop John Bothwell of Niagara, who have come forth with positive ideas on interfaith religious studies as contained in the Call for Action statement.

The delay is unacceptable to the students of our public school system, whose opportunity to reap the benefits of comparative religious studies has been put in limbo by the indecisiveness of a Liberal government which is totally unsure of its footing on this issue.

Finally, this delay is unacceptable to the people of Ontario. It should be obvious to this government that religious understanding plays an important part in the promotion of social tolerance and mutual respect among all members of this province's multifaith population. Religious studies in the public school system would allow it to continue to play its historic unifying role among people who are challenged by the ever-changing nature of Ontario.

I therefore call on the Liberal government to release the Watson report as soon as possible and to begin to establish a multifaith religious studies program acceptable to all public school teachers, trustees, parents and children.

One would expect that a government that has so greatly assisted this province's publicly funded separate school system, which is founded on a specific religious code, would show a comparable concern for the development of multifaith religious understanding in coterminous public schools in Ontario.

LITERACY

Mrs LeBourdais: I would like to welcome to the House today a group of constituents from Etobicoke West, who are here in recognition of their achievements in obtaining a personal goal.

As my friend the Minister of Education announced earlier this week, 1990 is International Literacy Year and this week has been declared Literacy Week in Ontario. Adult learners and instructors working in literacy and academic upgrading programs, operated by the continuing education department of the Etobicoke Board of Education, have produced a book entitled *Celebrate Our Stories*. It is a collection of warm, human interest stories written by the learners, with the instructors writing the accompanying language activity.

The result of this partnership in education speaks for itself and is indeed something to celebrate during International Literacy Year 1990. At a time when the level of illiteracy worldwide is approaching 900 million people, it is more than encouraging to meet a group of individuals who have met the challenge. There are solutions and people can work towards reading and writing.

Today, literacy means the ability to meet demands in new technologies that are being put on us for our increasingly sophisticated reading, writing and numeracy skills.

I had the honour to meet with some of the teachers, learners and volunteers recently while filming my cable show on literacy.

The need to improve literacy levels is recognized as a priority of the government of Ontario.

DRUG ABUSE

Mr Hampton: Two days ago the Toronto Globe and Mail disclosed that, because the Ministry of Health did not have adequate or enough drug rehabilitation programs, people from Ontario were being sent to private clinics in Texas, Colorado, Louisiana and elsewhere to receive drug rehabilitation treatment. The Globe and Mail noted that for one person to spend one day at these private US drug clinics would cost over \$800 per day or \$24,000 for a one-month treatment program.

In today's Toronto Star, Dr Blenos Pederson, a leading Ontario addiction specialist and staff psychiatrist at Toronto General Hospital, says that the Ministry of Health is actually spending \$8 million a year sending Ontario residents to private drug clinics in the United States when it could be doing the same job much more cheaply here at home. In contrast to the \$8 million the Ministry of Health spends in the United States, a new program at the Queen Street Mental Health Centre received a budget of only \$750,000.

In northwestern Ontario, for example, the Ministry of Health drug and alcohol treatment programs are completely inadequate. The ministry could find only \$172,000 for a drug and alcohol program for young adults at the Smith Clinic in Thunder Bay. Meanwhile, 45 Thunder Bay adolescents were

sent to Minneapolis for drug and alcohol abuse programs at a minimum charge of \$18,000 each for a 35-day program. Elsewhere, 150 northwestern Ontario residents had to be sent to the United States.

1340

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr McLean: My statement is for the Minister of Community and Social Services and it concerns a huge waiting list for children needing mental health care in Simcoe county. The 85 mental health centres that the government funds in Ontario have more than 10,000 children on waiting lists for mental health care services. In the Orillia area, the waiting list averages seven to eight months, and in some cases children have to wait as long as two years.

It is my understanding that most of those children are in immediate need of help. Many of these children are suicidal or violent. In some cases, there are five-year-olds who are attacking their brothers and sisters and seven-year-olds who are breaking teachers' fingers.

Clearly, these are kids who need help and they need it now, not eight months or two years from now. Many children have been abused sexually, emotionally or physically, and if they cannot get the help they require immediately, I fear that they will end up as young offenders.

The waiting list in the Orillia area continues to grow because of increased referrals from doctors, the children's aid society and family members. The growing waiting list is also a result of the underfunding and understaffing of mental health centres.

I would urge the minister to launch an immediate, independent review of the mental health care system and to give serious consideration to developing legislation that would give children the right to mental health treatment. Our future rests with our children, and right now the future for many of them does not look very bright.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms Oddie Munro: The unanimous Supreme Court decision of 3 May was a most significant landmark ruling. It upheld the acquittal of Lyn Lavalée in the shooting death of her husband, who had abused her on a continuous basis. It recognized the reality of the battered women's syndrome and the contingency in pleading self-defence as it relates to the apprehension of imminent danger to the well-founded anticipation of peril.

The Criminal Code provides the plea of self-defence if the accused believes on reasonable and probable grounds that one cannot otherwise preserve oneself from death or harm. The ruling of admissibility of expert testimony by psychiatrist Dr Fred Shane and the depth of understanding by the professional opinion rendered was critical to the defence of Miss Lavalée and to the ruling by the Supreme Court.

Dr Shane's testimony indicated that there is a pattern to the attacks by an abuser on the abused spouse, that the person being abused can sense when a threatened attack will be far more dangerous than those she has known and that, as Judge Bertha Wilson writes, "The mental state of an accused at the critical moment she pulls the trigger cannot be understood except in terms of the cumulative effect of months or years of brutality." Judge Wilson in writing the judgement said, "The appellant's shooting of the deceased was a final desperate act by a woman who believed that she would be killed that night."

How is it, we may ask, that a woman can be trapped for years in an abusive relationship and be incapable of leaving? What are the motives, feelings and reactions of the abused and the abuser? How will we be able to view this landmark decision and make sure that in Ontario, in our communities and in our homes, we must recognize that wife abuse and battering is a crime?

ZIGMAS VAISVILA

Mr R. F. Johnston: Last November my wife and I and the Canadian Lithuanian community invited Zigmas Vaisvila to come to Ontario. As members may recall, he opened up a whole new period of dialogue by appearing here in our Legislature with us.

I wanted to bring to the attention of members of this Legislature who met him and got to know him that on 20 April, as members may recall, the press building in Vilnius was taken over by the Soviet troops by force. Zigmas was there as a deputy of the Parliament to negotiate the peaceful transition, if that were to take place. He was beaten badly on the orders of the Soviet troops. He is now in hospital suffering from damage to his lungs and his intestines and has sustained a contusion to his brain.

I would encourage all members here to do several things: (1) write to him to offer our moral support; (2) request our government to officially complain to the federal government of the Soviet Union against this kind of action being taken against an elected deputy who was peacefully trying to negotiate; (3) contact the Canadian delegation to the Helsinki Accord conference to raise our concerns with the human rights violation.

It would be so important to any of us who are elected members of this Parliament to support the rights of a democratically elected individual to try to lobby on behalf of his citizens without being beaten.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mrs Cunningham: The Council of Ontario Universities recently sent me a letter that graphically portrays the crisis in universities in this province. Science and technology is a stated priority of this Liberal government, yet we are not exposing our students to the technology used in industry and research.

For example: Two truckloads of laboratory equipment used last year by University of Guelph engineering students was recently sent to the National Museum of Science and Technology in Ottawa, where it will go on display as ancient artefacts. Scientific equipment at 25-year-old Trent University is as old as the institution itself, and students currently use a spectrophotometer that is considered obsolete. A shortage of space at McMaster University has resulted in the reduction of first-year chemistry labs from once a week to once every two weeks. Laurier's science labs were built in the 1950s and have not been updated since. York uses converted cupboards and washrooms as laboratory space. The University of Toronto stated it lacks basic teaching aids, computers, something we all have in our offices.

If the Liberals think they have addressed the problem of inadequate facilities and equipment at our universities with a token acknowledgement in the budget, they are sadly mistaken. Our equipment is deteriorating and young people are leaving our country.

MEMBER FOR NIAGARA SOUTH

Mr Haggerty: There are rumours and speculations that there may well be a provincial election called some time in the near future. That has raised some concerns with constituents whom I have served in the Niagara South Liberal Provincial Association.

After careful consideration over the past few weeks and discussing the matter with my wife, Marie, and family members, I have decided not to seek re-election in the event of a possible provincial election being called. My 23 years in office representing Welland South, Erie and Niagara South ridings have been a rewarding experience, a pleasure to serve so many wonderful constituents.

I want to extend sincere appreciation to everyone in the riding for the confidence and trust they have placed in me over the many years at Queen's Park. Their kindness, support, advice and encouragement have been major factors in making a difficult task more readily acceptable.

The Niagara South constituents are the greatest, very accommodating and understanding. The area municipal officials, the many service clubs, employers, employees—every citizen—have been supportive and a pleasure to work with in resolving issues.

Politics to me is a process of bargaining, a compromise that seeks common ground in resolving issues in the best interests of the people we serve. The opportunity comes only once in a lifetime. I have been honoured to serve and to participate in an important role in a free and democratic system of government.

I want to thank my staff at Queen's Park and the constituency staff members for their outstanding commitment to me and the citizens of Niagara South riding in the province of Ontario.

I have enjoyed my role in opposition, as well as a government member, and particularly my role as parliamentary assistant to the ministers of Government Services, Municipal Affairs and Consumer and Commercial Relations.

There is a time in one's life when a person must look to other alternatives, to pursue a different course to fulfil life's expectations.

One cannot forget and reflect upon the many elections fought since 1967 through 1987. Working with many volunteers, who gave so generously of their time, energy, talent and convictions to the democratic process of government in a free nation, is greatly appreciated.

I want to thank all honourable members, the Clerk and staff of the assembly for their assistance and words of wisdom. Marie and I and the family will for ever cherish those precious memories. We appreciate the continued friendship and trust that have been generated over 23 years and look forward to continued friendship, visiting so many wonderful people.

1350

Mr Laughren: Mr Speaker, I wonder if the members of the assembly would allow me a minute or two to respond to the statement by the member for Niagara South.

The Speaker: Do I see heads nodding in the affirmative?

Mr Laughren: I have not been here all of the time Mr Haggerty has been here. He was elected in 1967 and I was elected in 1971. During those years, I have spent a lot of time on various committees with him. I can tell members that his dedication to his job in the committee work was second to none. You could always be sure, whether a committee was travelling or whether it was meeting in Toronto, that Ray Haggerty would be there if he was serving on the committee. I have

no doubt whatsoever that he served his constituents with the same amount of dedication that he served on committees around this place. I know that I for one will miss Ray's attendance here in the House.

Mr Cureatz: Might I say to the honourable member on behalf of my caucus, the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario, that I too would like to extend best wishes to my friend and colleague, the honourable member. Indeed, he had already been a member for 10 years when I was first elected in 1977 but, as my honourable colleague the member for Nickel Belt indicated, Ray and I have served on a number of committees over the last number of years.

From time to time I like to think that I have learned something important from him, and that was to set aside partisan politics and to do the job we have been elected to do, which is representing individual constituents in our riding. There is no doubt that for his long tenure of service that is exactly what he has done. I know only too well that good wishes and hopes will follow his way, after leaving the chamber whenever the next election is.

Hon R. F. Nixon: I want to express my personal regrets at the honourable member's statement. I had heard just a few moments ago that he was going to do so, although I knew that he had been considering the possibility of not running in this election. But I thought that perhaps, like some others who had been considering these matters, he would have decided that once more was all right. It is nice to know that there are some people with principle still available in this House.

I have been closely associated with Ray Haggerty through our mutual political careers. There have been many occasions when our caucus was somewhat smaller even than any caucus represented here. We used to meet every day at noon so that the course of the good ship Liberal was well defined, as the people who read of our escapades in those days would be able to discern. We have had many opportunities to discuss matters.

I have always found that he was a good politician, but a man with shrewd judgement and able to give his advice in direct and certain terms. If anything, I suppose I have felt that his predictions usually were predictions of difficulty and disaster, and in almost every case that I can recall, he was right.

I have had a number of opportunities to campaign with him in Niagara South or Erie. The constituency has been loyal to the Liberal Party, but I sense the loyalty was to Ray, who before he ever entered this House had an excellent, worthy career in municipal politics. As the representative of union and working people in his area, he has continued to be a strong and clear voice for a wide range of policies, but with the emphasis in that area, to which the Liberal Party has always responded so well and so truly.

In this respect I want to join of course with others, but speak at this occasion on behalf of his many colleagues on this side, all of us his good friends, express our regret, thank him for his service and wish him well.

The Speaker: The only thing I can say is that the class of 1967 is fading.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Hon Mr Scott: I am pleased today to be able to inform my colleagues in the House about a province-wide, anti-drinking-and-driving campaign. The Ontario Community Council on Impaired Driving has designated next week as Arrive

Alive—Drive Sober Week. The week starts next Sunday and will run until the end of the Victoria Day weekend.

The Ontario Community Council on Impaired Driving, an initiative of this government, was created in early 1990. The council represents some 55 anti-impaired-driving groups in the province. Its mandate is to co-ordinate resources and implement province-wide awareness programs such as Arrive Alive Week.

The creation of the council represents an important step in the government's ongoing effort to eliminate or reduce impaired driving. We have long recognized that the problem of impaired driving will only be solved when the community as a whole acknowledges it and confronts it directly. One of the primary mandates for the countermeasures office in my ministry has therefore been to encourage community involvement across the province. The council is the direct result of that effort.

The summer is a time traditionally devoted to family and vacations but, tragically, it is also the time when alcohol-related crashes are at their very peak. Arrive Alive—Drive Sober Week is an opportunity once again to focus public attention on this terrible problem, and throughout the summer the Ontario Community Council on Impaired Driving will work closely with my ministry's countermeasures office to keep the dangers of drinking and driving foremost in the minds of drivers and passengers across Ontario.

Community groups, the council and the provincial government will not be working alone. In response to a request sent out by the Premier to all municipal and regional councils, a substantial number of municipalities throughout Ontario have declared their support by proclaiming Arrive Alive—Drive Sober Week in their communities. Corporate sponsors, provincial park administrators and municipal personnel will be joining forces with community groups to help raise and maintain public awareness through information centres, workshops, promotions and a variety of local events.

Arrive Alive—Drive Sober Week highlights a larger, year-round effort to reduce impaired driving. The drinking-driving countermeasures office of the ministry has recently provided over \$200,000 in support funding for 23 prominent anti-impaired-driving groups which are active all year long.

In addition, I am particularly pleased to note that the number of schools participating in the anti-impaired-driving programs offered by the countermeasures office has again increased. The countermeasures office provided over \$100,000 to 117 secondary schools for their 1989-90 anti-impaired driving activities, as compared to 75 schools the previous year, an important and significant increase.

The ministry will also provide funding to hire two high school students per community for July and August in 30 to 40 locations across Ontario. There is in the gallery today, for example, a group of students from Lindsay Collegiate and Vocational Institute who are anxious to participate in this program. These students will continue the work started during this week and will continue promoting public awareness during the very dangerous months of the summer.

Finally, I want to tell the House about our new media campaign related to drinking and driving. Coincident with the Arrive Alive Week, three new, strong-messaged, 15-second television commercials will be released on Monday next. Coupled with radio messages and transit vehicle ads all across Ontario, the theme of this year's summer campaign is "You can lose a lot more than your licence" by drinking and driving.

Based on research, we are targeting young male drivers, who are still the greatest offenders. They have expressed their concern over the potential loss of their freedom, their loved

ones and injury to themselves if they drink and drive. Our summer advertising campaign picks up on these concerns and I believe emphasizes the dangers and the risks in no uncertain terms.

The government, and my ministry in particular, has been and will continue to be extremely active in the effort to reduce the death and destruction caused by impaired drivers on our roadways. Significant progress has been made in the last five years, but there is still a long way to go.

1400

HERITAGE CONSERVATION

CONSERVATION DU PATRIMOINE ONTARIEN

Hon Ms Hart: I am pleased to inform the House that the government will draft comprehensive new legislation to strengthen and revise the Ontario Heritage Act. This legislation will reflect the challenges highlighted by the Ontario heritage policy review's final report, which I am releasing today. The report outlines a new vision of what heritage encompasses and establishes a series of goals.

These five goals are to foster awareness that our heritage is vital to our success as a people, particularly by putting more emphasis on the interpretation and promotion of heritage resources; to strengthen provincial government leadership by improving co-ordination among the 15 ministries with an impact on heritage; to empower Ontario communities to undertake high-quality heritage conservation by strengthening their decision-making role and integrating heritage considerations into the local planning process; to stimulate private sector involvement by providing incentives for individual property owners and corporate interests and promoting heritage tourism; to guarantee access to the latest heritage knowledge and information by supporting education and research and by improving communication within the heritage sector.

The policy review, as members will recall, was launched in 1987 with three aims: to create a cross-government policy framework for heritage conservation activities, which currently involves 15 ministries; to foster wider public appreciation of Ontario's diverse heritage, and to update the Ontario Heritage Act.

The review process included public meetings across the province, written submissions, extensive discussions with government ministries and agencies, and direct consultation with a broad range of provincial organizations representing nearly 2,000 local heritage groups.

Through this process we have reviewed the various forms heritage takes. Traditional and modern architecture, folklore and natural landscapes are just a few examples. A fundamental element links these resources together—each of them tells us something about who we are.

Le patrimoine ontarien est une ressource vivante ; c'est la base de notre identité ainsi que de notre bien-être social et économique. C'est aussi une source de confiance à l'égard de ce que nous pouvons réaliser. Plus nous connaissons notre patrimoine, plus nous comprenons qui nous sommes et ce que nous pouvons faire.

Heritage is the link between our past and our future. It is an expression of our collective experience and a guide to our ongoing development. This is our new vision. In order to realize our new vision, I expect to introduce a new Ontario Heritage Act in the House this fall.

The development of new heritage legislation will be accomplished through a consultation process with Ontario or-

ganizations, ranging from traditional heritage groups to those representing municipal, construction and tourism interests.

DIALYSIS

Hon Mrs Caplan: As members of this House are aware, treatment of kidney disease is one of several specialty care areas in which my ministry is concentrating its resources.

With the \$23-million, three-year program begun last June, we set ourselves a target of at least 25 additional dialysis machines in the first year. Some were to be placed in acute care hospitals, some in patients' homes and some, for the first time, in chronic care hospitals. My ministry has more than lived up to that commitment. The specific allocation of funds I am announcing today brings the total of additional dialysis machines funded in the first year of this program to no less than 30.

As early as last November, we approved and funded five new haemodialysis stations for the Oshawa General Hospital as well as one new peritoneal dialysis station, and 24 more machines around the province are being funded today.

But machines are not the whole answer. The more sophisticated machines in hospitals need people to run them and to assist the patients using them. The more hours per day and days per week they can stay in operation, the more people who can be served. So another aspect of this important program is the funding of staff and medical supplies to allow expanded use of the dialysis machines already in place in Ontario. We have accomplished this in a number of hospital settings, beginning right away last June with the Credit Valley Hospital in Mississauga. A third shift of nurses and technologists was added, enabling them to treat 20 more dialysis patients a week. Today, I am directing still more funds to this aspect of dialysis treatment in a number of hospitals.

Happily, not all patients with kidney disease need to be treated in hospitals, as was once the case. Advances in technology have made dialysis at home possible for a growing number. Home dialysis often, though not always, requires the help of a visiting attendant. Some of my ministry's funding goes towards providing that help. Some also goes to assist in the training of patients who will be largely able to administer their own treatments at home.

Today's funding allocation takes into account other commitments made by my ministry. One was to place dialysis machines, for the first time, in chronic care hospitals. I am pleased to announce that the Wellesley Hospital in Toronto will receive \$696,000 to develop a joint pilot project with Riverdale Hospital. Chronic care patients at Riverdale who need dialysis treatments will no longer have to be transported back and forth to another hospital every few days. Four new dialysis units at Riverdale itself will serve those patients. At the same time, the Wellesley Hospital will receive nearly \$202,000 to expand its own dialysis treatments through extended staffing.

Another area of concern for my ministry is the availability of dialysis treatment in northern Ontario. We said we would begin to address this in the first year of our three-year program. I am pleased to announce that almost \$555,000 will be allocated to the Lake of the Woods District Hospital in Kenora to establish a satellite dialysis centre with two units, and another \$1.14 million will fund a four-unit satellite dialysis centre to be established by the Porcupine General Hospital in South Porcupine near Timmins. It will operate in conjunction with Laurentian Hospital in Sudbury.

Other funding to expand hospital-based dialysis includes \$824,000 for three new dialysis units at Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital.

I am particularly pleased that we will also be funding more home dialysis programs in four areas of the province. Kingston General Hospital will receive \$735,000 to expand its peritoneal dialysis program. The money will go to provide supplies as well as staff to teach home dialysis patients how to treat themselves. Ottawa General Hospital receives nearly \$190,000 for four machines to expand its home haemodialysis program. The Toronto Hospital receives \$472,000 for another seven haemodialysis machines and helpers for its home treatment program. St Joseph's Hospital in Hamilton will use funding of \$278,000 for a project to help peritoneal dialysis patients who otherwise would not be able to treat themselves at home. St Joseph's will organize helpers who can do the rounds of these home patients and be there when their assistance is needed.

As members of this House are well aware, dialysis in most cases is buying time for a kidney transplant. A kidney transplant is the nearest thing to a cure at present. Transplant operations rely on organ donation and retrieval. Last June, I announced additional funding of \$300,000 a year to MORE, Ontario's multiple organ retrieval and exchange program, bringing its total annual funding by my ministry to \$1.3 million.

In January of this year, to bolster the MORE program, the government amended regulations under the Public Hospitals Act so that hospitals are now required to develop policies and guidelines to encourage organ donations. In conjunction with that vital program, I would like to take this opportunity today to urge people everywhere to consider seriously the pledge of an organ donation. Even in death, the opportunity exists to make a gift of life.

1410

RESPONSES

HERITAGE CONSERVATION

Miss Martel: I want to respond on behalf of our party to the statement made by the Minister of Culture and Communications. We are pleased with the release of this report today after a very long, long time in its preparation. We want to join with the government in thanking all of those particular groups and individuals across the province who participated in the hearings and the consultation process leading up to the report.

Members of the House will recognize that the heritage of this province is very important; it is also very diverse. Whether we talk about arts or culture, whether we talk about language, buildings or monuments, all of those things need to be protected and we have to ensure as a province and as a government that the legislation that is put forward this fall, hopefully, will be legislation that will in fact protect those values and ensure that in Ontario we remain rich in that diversity and use every mechanism that we can to recognize and promote the differences which enrich our whole existence here in Ontario instead of actually dividing us.

I want to make two points, though, if I might, in regard to the report. First, I hope that the report says a great deal about the protection that municipalities, and in particular LACACs, need when it comes to their protection and their desire to protect heritage values. The minister will recognize that within her own ministry there have been many disputes between small municipalities trying to protect monuments, buildings in particular, against big developers who want to use that land to build condominiums etc, and they have not found in the legislation the means they need to protect that heritage and to keep it in place.

Second, I want to say that the consultation process was indeed very lengthy. I appreciate that; it is better than some of the processes we have seen around here around other bills. But I would point out that this has taken some three years, some 250 groups and individuals, 26 public meetings, 2,000 provincial heritage organizations represented and government ministries etc. Today again we see a statement that the process is going to begin again and did today with 46 other agencies. I hope that in fact there is some legislation before this House finally in September of this year.

But I want to congratulate the minister again, and I look forward to dealing with this legislation if indeed she and I are both back here in September 1990.

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Mr Kormos: We welcome the announcement of the Attorney General this afternoon, and indeed there is not a single person here who is not supportive of this type of program. There is not a single one of us who, when we get back to our communities, is not going to support the Arrive Alive—Drive Sober Week.

What an important issue for this government to attempt to deal with. Once again we are supportive of this government's stated commitment not just to reduce impaired driving but to eliminate it. But how can this government hope to do that when it announces 15-second TV spots that are going to appear by way of advertising that will undoubtedly run alongside the new, liberalized, expanded liquor advertising that this government permitted the liquor industry just in the last few weeks?

The contradiction inherent in announcing support for an anti-drinking-and-driving campaign across the province when this government falls prey to the clout of the liquor industry and the beer industry here in Ontario and permits them to advertise in a way they have not been permitted to advertise in almost a decade now, I tell you, Mr Speaker, is shameful.

It is shameful that this government knows full well that driver training is so essential to the safe operation of vehicles on the highways, yet this government will not do a thing, notwithstanding the pleas by people like John Bates from PRIDE, People to Reduce Impaired Driving Everywhere, to institute finally some effective driver training programs that people have to pass before they are even considered eligible for drivers' licences.

This government has got a long way to go before it really starts to do something to stop drinking and driving in this province.

DIALYSIS

Mr Reville: Clearly we are pleased that the government is keeping its commitments made a year ago to improve dialysis treatment in Ontario. I should warn the Liberal government that nothing for Scarborough-Ellesmere means that the former member, David Warner, will speak about that omission loudly and often, and very shortly he will return to this place and stand up and say, as he did once before, "As I was saying before I was interrupted, where is the dialysis unit for Scarborough-Ellesmere?"

Mr Eves: I would like to respond briefly to the announcement made in the Legislature this afternoon by the Minister of Health. I guess the old adage "Better late than never" comes to mind. The Minister of Health has known about this problem in kidney dialysis—it has been pointed out to her repeatedly by members on the opposition benches—for several

years, let alone months. I am glad to see that she is finally responding. I just would hope, of course, that there is no ulterior political motive in the back of her mind with respect to this.

I would also like to echo a reference she makes in her statement. It is fine to supply money for capital expenditures and for equipment, but without the personnel to deliver those health care services that all Ontarians need, such commitments are meaningless.

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Ms Cunningham: I would like to respond to the statement with regard to Arrive Alive—Drive Sober Week. All of us in the province are very concerned about the real statistics regarding alcohol use and driving statistics in Canada and in Ontario. About 3,000 Canadians die each year as a result of driving while impaired.

Drinking while driving is the leading criminal cause of death for all Canadians. In Toronto, every 14th driver is impaired at any time of the day and on weekends one out of four drivers is impaired. Some 30% of arrested drunk drivers are alcoholics and alcohol use by Ontario university students is rampant and increasing.

Metropolitan Toronto doubled its alcohol-related crash fatalities in 1988. Anything we can do to assist in the prevention of driving while impaired, in the prevention of alcoholism, in the treatment of alcoholics and in fact in improved driver training programs, is welcomed not only by the Progressive Conservative Party but by all persons across the province.

This issue of driving while impaired is one that we are all concerned about, and I commend the government for its program and especially for using young people as part of this program, not only for today or this week or all summer but for the years and weeks to come.

HERITAGE CONSERVATION

Mrs Marland: In responding to the Minister of Culture and Communications' statement, we want to make note of the fact that it has taken three and a half years to get this far. I hope that now we are this far, it will not take another three and a half years to get the legislation.

We feel very strongly that this legislation is overdue. We also want to comment on the minister's recent comment in London—I guess the minister has left, but I will tell you anyway, Mr Speaker—in which she said, "I will be moving very quickly to bring in legislation that will enable municipalities to do what they have to do to keep what they want to keep." We feel that comment is a little hollow when it has taken three and a half years to get this far, and we wonder if perhaps the new, added urgency has something to do with the threatened Talbot streetscape in downtown London, right in the Premier's backyard.

Nevertheless, we know there are good things about pending elections and elections hovering over the people of Ontario because, suddenly, after five years of inaction, we are getting all these wonderful announcements and promises. It will be a refreshing change if and when that election comes, that we certainly end up having some of these promises fulfilled.

I want in closing to make sure that we as a caucus express our compliments to the former minister, the member for Hamilton Centre. I am convinced that the member for Hamilton Centre did a great deal towards the preservation of our heritage and we thank her for the efforts of herself as minister at that time.

Also, as the Environment critic, I think the government should take note of these printouts today, these reports and the folder that goes with them, including the minister's statement. It has to be the heaviest, most expensive glossy paper that is available on the market today.

1420

Mr Eves: Mr Speaker, it being the member for Sarnia's last day serving as leader of our party, could I ask the unanimous consent of the House to make some statements?

[Applause]

The Speaker: I believe that response is indicative of approval.

MEMBER FOR SARNIA

Mr Eves: It indeed does me proud to be able to speak on behalf of our party with respect to the leadership that the member for Sarnia has given to our party.

The member for Sarnia is a humble man; some would say he has a lot to be humble about. When Andy first became the leader of our party, he promised us nothing—and he delivered. I was talking to his wife, Patricia, the other day, and I know that Andy is far too modest to have mentioned this, but they recently had a fire in their residence and their library was destroyed; both books were missing. But the part that really disturbed the member for Sarnia was that he had not finished colouring the second one. He taught me everything I know, by the way, which is not much.

Hon R. F. Nixon: I think he wrote this speech.

Mr Eves: It is just the way he wrote it; exactly the way he wrote it.

Everybody in this place and beyond knows of the challenge the member for Sarnia inherited when he became the leader of our party. I think a real leader is one who leads by example and I think the member for Sarnia, if he has done anything in his tenure as our leader, has demonstrated to us, to all members of the Legislature and indeed to all Ontarians that nothing can replace hard work and sincere dedication in approach to your position in life.

When I think of the timeless effort and the numbers that we have today, I think Mr Brandt has improved our party and hopefully improved the lot of Ontarians in every walk of life. I have known Andy since I have been a member at Queen's Park, when we were elected together in 1981. He is a very genuine and sincere individual. The member for Sarnia has a genuine rapport with individuals from all walks of life, even the media.

Interjections.

Mr Eves: Perhaps that is stretching a point, but it does prove the effectiveness and the genuine approach that the member for Sarnia has taken to his position.

His selfless approach to leadership has certainly been an example for all of us in this place. I think probably one of his best attributes is that he never takes himself or his position too seriously. Because we are dealing with serious issues in this place from time to time and debate does become rather political at times, I think it is a great lesson for all of us to learn that we should never take ourselves too seriously; indeed the member for Sarnia has certainly led by example in that regard. It is not everyone who has that ability and that unique quality. Our party has certainly benefited from his leadership. We have not only

benefited in concrete terms but we have benefited in terms of morale as well.

I have known the member for Sarnia at his best—as a friend, as a colleague, as the leader of my party. I have known him at his worst—as a Detroit Tigers fan at a baseball game. I really think the approach and the humble manner in which he goes about his position, both inside and outside of this Legislature, is a lesson that we can all learn from.

A position as interim leader is a tenuous position at best and I can say that the member for Sarnia has delivered quality leadership equalled by none that I can think of in recent memory in our party. The temptation must have been great for him upon occasion to renege on the commitment that he made to our caucus about two and a half years ago to serve as an interim leader.

I am sure there are those on all sides of the House and all throughout the province of Ontario who think he should have reneged on that commitment, but I think that fact alone demonstrates the type of individual that the member for Sarnia is. He is an individual of honour, commitment, determination and dignity, and we on this side of the House will miss him greatly as leader.

Hon R. F. Nixon: It is my great honour and pleasure to respond on behalf of the Liberal Party on this important and interesting occasion. The Premier expresses his regrets through me. He is absent from the House, and actually from Toronto, on important business; but I can assure the member, and I need not make the assurance, of his personal good wishes, which I know he will extend on other occasions.

When I realized that I had this difficult responsibility, I did what I usually do, and that is go and see the leader of the third party for a few jokes that would be appropriate. Unfortunately, he let me down for the first time and said, "Bob, you're on your own." So if the quality of my intervention here is a little bit reduced, it is because he refused, for the first time, to give me a couple of zingers.

I was interested that the member for Parry Sound, in talking on behalf of the Conservatives about his good friend, said he was characterized by his commitment to hard work and his dedication to service. We all agree with that, but my friend the Attorney General said, "And also his good humour." I said, "I believe, frankly, in reverse order." I have no doubts about his dedication, but his good humour sets him apart from all of us—

Interjections.

Hon R. F. Nixon: —"all of you," let's put it that way—and makes an impossible job doable. There is never an occasion, however seriously he gets his back into criticism—and there are many occasions where criticism is perhaps moderately warranted—where you feel that this is strictly a function of political responsibility and he is able to very properly contain his personal feelings in this regard. It is something that not everybody can do, and a few of us should certainly take lessons from his example. I intend to do that some time further on in my career.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the honourable member because I too experienced almost the identical situation, but not quite. In 1975, following an election which my party was supposed to win, when the smoke cleared away and the votes were counted, I found myself leading the third party on an interim basis with two of my colleagues vying to succeed me.

So I know exactly how pleasant and sometimes how onerous that job can be, because certainly in a political contest the people who are upwardly mobile, unlike the honourable

member and myself, have to undertake certain political exigencies which are sometimes out of character, and the leader, interim or whatever, is left to paper over the cracks and see that everybody, even if he or she is not pulling carefully in harness, appears to be doing so. The honourable member has done a good job of that—as a matter of fact, as I recall, a little better than I did.

1430

Meanwhile, earlier this week, I was thinking about his career. When he came in from Sarnia, I had known him in a previous political incarnation, which I sometimes refer to. I am not going to do it again. The fact that he used to appear at Liberal meetings in something other than his capacity as mayor I am not going to refer to, other than to say that if he had been loyal to his first set of principles—and I understand he has a number of sets—he might very well have been Treasurer of Ontario or maybe, a continuation of his first love, the Minister of the Environment. We would not have had the leadership and movement forward that we have here, but we must remember that the honourable member was the discoverer of the blob in the St Clair River. Was that not his claim to fame, as I recall it? It took the member for St Catharines to get rid of it. He is working on a few other blobs, but in the long run—

Interjections.

Hon R. F. Nixon: When I think of it, before he assumed the leadership of the great Progressive Conservative Party, the honourable member probably reached the epitome of his career as Minister of Industry and Trade. Under those circumstances, of course, he was given the gold credit card that enabled him to travel around the world, and he was and still is, in my view, particularly well fitted to making friends and influencing people, in the best sense of that word. So whatever we think of his political philosophies, and his commitment to democracy and fairness in democracy is never questioned, I just want to express our thanks and appreciation for his service.

We look to the future, of course. He will be giving up the leadership in the next few days and hours; to whom, we will find out. We will be making speeches next week welcoming someone to that onerous new responsibility. What to do now that he leaves his leadership? I have read in the paper that he is on the short list for Ontario Hydro, that he is very keen to be the commissioner of sewer services. I just advise him not to even think about London. If worse came to worst, he might throw himself at the mercy of his federal friends, because, after all, they are cousins under the skin and he has had to bear that millstone around his neck of supporting on all occasions the federal initiatives.

Perhaps if I were to give him the best advice, it would be to just keep doing what he does best. That is to attempt once again, if there is an election, God forbid, in the next few months, to represent the people of Sarnia. There are worse fates. We would do the best we could, and I would predict our success in ending his career, but if that were not to happen, the members of the House, recognizing his undoubted abilities, his understanding of the democratic process and his record of service on both sides of this House, would feel he was serving his community well indeed if he would put aside all those alternatives and try to come back here.

I cannot say that I wish him well in all his endeavours, but in some of the things I have said there may be my personal feeling of friendship and admiration for one of the finest members we have had in this House in my experience.

Mr B. Rae: First of all, I want to say to the Treasurer that we took careful note of the statement he made that there were going to be speeches in this place here next Monday and Tuesday. We look forward to that for many reasons.

Hon R. F. Nixon: I told you he was out of town. Actually he is walking down the hall right now.

Mr Reville: Don't make our day today.

Mr B. Rae: We all look for these signals.

A very unkind person would say when Mr Brandt was looking in the St Clair River and saw the blob that in fact it was a reflection, but I would not say that.

Interjections.

Mr B. Rae: Oh well, the member for Parry Sound started it, and I have actually spoken at a roast for Andy and we were able to raise, I think, some money for a good cause, and I would be delighted to do it again. As long as the cause is a neutral one, I would be delighted to serve in that role.

The Treasurer and the member for Parry Sound have said it all in terms of the feelings that I know everyone in this House has for Andy. I just want to say a few very brief words about our relationship and, I think, some things perhaps behind the scenes, if you like, or the real world of the personal relations in this place that sometimes the public does not understand.

As the Treasurer said, we all of us argue and dispute in this place and sometimes have some extremely unpleasant things to say about one another. The simple fact of the matter is that, despite that fact, we all of us establish friendships across party lines, and that is, I think, a wonderful thing. We share a commitment to a common profession, a profession which is in significant disrepute, it is fair to say. Whether it is any worse than at any other time, I have no idea, but I think we all realize that when people talk to their children about careers they might follow, the profession of politics is perhaps not uppermost in people's minds.

I would like to say that when I came to this place, I noted the extraordinary personal skill of the then minister of cabinet. He was somebody who managed to obfuscate on the subject of the environment as well as any of the 47 Tory predecessors he had in that portfolio, or indeed the successor he has had in that portfolio. He went on to a brief but spectacular career as the Minister of Industry and Trade and then faced the realities of opposition and then the ultimate reality, which of course is becoming the leader of the third party, a job which I performed for a time. One can never tell what futures will unfold; indeed, in many respects we know that this is a roller-coaster on which we live.

We share a very small world—not tiny, but not as large as we would like it to be—on this side of the House. We share a little room back there where the leader and I share many jokes and quips. We share stories with one another, none of which frankly are repeatable particularly. But we have also had occasion to meet on many occasions to talk about issues and to share ideas. We had one really good argument on a matter of principle, which, I can say to members, we have very successfully patched up, and it is healthy to have those disagreements. He is somebody who I have enormous affection for, and great respect.

Much has been said about Andy's humour. Like many people of good humour, it is important to understand the humour belies a seriousness of purpose and in a sense a seriousness of intent about the things that he believes in and about his enormous effectiveness. If I may be quite blunt about it, the

member for Sarnia did not become the mayor of Sarnia, the member for Sarnia, a member of the cabinet and the leader of his party simply because he was a jolly good fellow. We all know that good humour belies enormous substances—substance. I should not have said “substances.” I have no reason to believe that. On this of all days, given the Attorney General’s announcement today, it surely would be inappropriate to refer to it.

1440

I do want to say one other thing about Andy. Throughout the time that we have shared this opposition bench, there have been many moments when we have both understood some of the personal tensions and difficulties of being leader, of having to perform publicly when that was a difficult thing to do. I want to say to Andy that no one has shown me greater kindness and greater good humour and good cheer, in the best sense, at difficult times than he has, and I appreciate that. I know there are many others in his caucus who appreciate a similar sensitivity and a similar understanding and who also appreciate that this is a very good man.

I have often quoted Abraham Lincoln’s phrase, which I think is a very accurate and acute one. It simply says, “When you measure a person, measure him around the heart.” I think if we were to measure the member for Sarnia, Andy Brandt, around the heart, we would find that he broke the tape.

Mr Brandt: I want to say that perhaps the best piece of advice I have ever received as I walked into this Legislative Assembly was from my friend and colleague the Leader of the Opposition, who said: “There may well be some nice things said about you today, and I would give you just this little piece of advice: Don’t inhale too deeply.” I shall follow that advice very carefully.

I recognize the words of kindness and affection that were expressed by members of all three parties, and they mean a great deal to me because of the very unique and special role that we all perform in this assembly.

I am, however, reminded as well of the time that Winston Churchill was in the House and a page rushed in to give the great Prime Minister a little note. Winston looked at the note and he was surprised to find that, unexpectedly, a death had occurred; one of the adversaries from the other side of the House had in fact passed away of a heart attack. Winston was asked by one of his advisers if he would like to say perhaps some nice words of kindness about that individual, at which point Winston rose from his seat in the House of Commons and walked to the back, where the members assemble. He sought out this particular adviser who had sent the note and said, “Listen, I understand that good old Fred has died of a heart attack but, before I say anything really nice about him, will you make absolutely certain that he’s really dead?”

I do not know whether that has application to me this afternoon, but I feel very much alive and I just trust that Hansard will record all of these words as accurately as they have been expressed. During those lonesome nights that ex-leaders spend by themselves watching the debates on television as you sit quietly in the back row, I would like to refer to them and sort of read especially those nice things said by the Treasurer and Deputy Premier of this province.

Hon R. F. Nixon: Don’t inhale.

Mr Brandt: I will not inhale but, with his permission, I may take the odd breath occasionally.

I say to all members in a non-partisan way, it has been an honour and a privilege for me, as leader of my party, to have served in I guess what we would all recognize as a somewhat difficult position over the course of the past two and a half years. I have had the opportunity and the honour and privilege of serving in government; I was chosen by the Premier of the day to serve in cabinet, which indeed is a very real privilege and a distinct honour. I have also served in the opposition, both Her Majesty’s loyal opposition and also her equally loyal third party in opposition.

I have enjoyed all sides of this House because, and it has been expressed by those more eloquent than myself, this is certainly a very unique club. There are 130 of us here who wrestle with the issues of the day, who try in our own fashion, based on whatever talents and abilities that we might be able to bring to this place, to perhaps set a focus and a direction as to where we think the province should be going. When you really think of it, 130 people out of 9.5 million residents is a tremendous honour that I think we all have to remind ourselves of each and every day that we walk in these doors. It brings with it a very special responsibility.

If you have the opportunity, and I hope some of you do—in the case of the New Democrats, I hope that the rush does not happen too quickly in this respect—I hope that you are one of three who will move into the position of leader at some point in time and have the opportunity to serve, as I have, in a very distinct fashion and in a very different way than any other roles that I have had an opportunity to play. It is just entirely different, I can assure you. There are many challenges. There are many good days; there are many bad days. I would prefer to remember the good days rather than those days that were perhaps not as good.

On this particular occasion—and I will try, as I usually do, to keep my remarks relatively brief—I want to thank a few people, if I might; first, my wife and family. My wife, Patricia, of course, has had to put up with my being absent from home on far too many occasions. I think she is beginning to enjoy it; so I thought perhaps I should terminate my political career in terms of leadership at this particular juncture. But she has been most patient and understanding. We all know the sacrifices that the family makes when we engage in our professional occupations here at the assembly.

Certainly the executive of my party—and the president of our party is in the gallery today—I would like to thank Kay Wetherall and the executive, as well as those members of our party who perhaps do not serve in a direct capacity on that executive who have been most supportive of me during some interesting times.

Your home riding is one that is very difficult to serve. You keep a balance between those things that you want to do here and those things that have to be done back home. We all have that kind of tremendous problem sorting out priorities as to where we should be, and on occasion I guess the constituents may have to sacrifice because of another responsibility that you may have here at Queen’s Park in Toronto. I would like to thank them as well.

Most particularly, however, I think it would be remiss of me if I did not, in a very personal way, thank the members of my caucus. I have had a dedicated, hardworking and loyal group of people who gave me their advice. Sometimes they gave me their advice too frequently, but they gave me their advice, their guidance, and certainly they stuck with me and were behind me all the way during the time when our party was going through the very type of development and reorganization that every

political party of whatever stripe has had to go through at some point in its history. What came out of that was a sense of teamwork, a sense of unity and a sense of loyalty that I want to say to all of them I shall not forget.

I would also like to thank those people who are maybe the unsung heroes around here, the clerks of the House, who make this place work so well and are so co-operative, the Sergeant at Arms, the OPP and the members of the government service. They have done a great deal to make my time here more pleasant. They always have a friendly smile, as they do for most members, and they actually treat us like human beings, which is most appreciated at times. They have been very professional and of course they have been very non-partisan.

1450

I would like to thank the Deputy Premier for his kind remarks, and certainly the Leader of the Opposition and my House leader, the member for Parry Sound, for the things they have said. I recognize, as the Deputy Premier already pointed out, that the Premier could not be here today. He was kind enough to join with me at noon, when we had a very brief social gathering in my office. I would like to say to the Deputy Premier, since I am in much closer contact with the Premier than he is, that the Premier is in New York today. It is probably something he did not share with the Deputy Premier. He was off on some government business. When he reports back to me later on today as to the success of his mission, I will share the balance of that information with the Deputy Premier. I do very much appreciate the Premier extending his good wishes through the Deputy Premier. He certainly knows of my respect and my affection for both him and the Premier, other than when it comes to question period.

Again, I appreciate those comments by all members who have spoken. I will hold them very dear for a long period of time to come.

Just in closing, I would like to say that, as I indicated, the unique democracy that we practise in this place is something that means a great deal to me. When we look at those things that are happening in so many parts of the world and so many problems that have developed as a result of people not having this mechanism for vetting the various differences of opinion, and when you see that words are used in here as opposed to guns and violence in other areas, I believe you have got to appreciate that this is a very important, very vital and very critical process that just has to continue and one that we have collectively to protect to the extent that we can.

I have enjoyed the past two and a half years. As I said, I will remember the good times. I will remember the kindness and the consideration of each and every member of the House. I want, however, to remind all members of the assembly that I am going to be around for a while yet but in a different capacity. I want to say especially to my good friend the Attorney General that he has not seen the last of me yet. I expect to be back in this chamber and in this House pursuing issues of importance and entering into the necessary debates in order to do what I think it is that we are all elected to carry out, and that is to best serve the people of this province based on our abilities and our talents and whatever we can bring to this place in our own unique way.

I wish all the members well. I thank them for being who they are and what they have been in the last two and a half years. Let me just say that I will look forward to serving in a somewhat different capacity come Monday.

The Speaker: The next item of business will be oral questions.

Some hon members: Dispense.

The Speaker: Dispense?

Some hon members: No.

The Speaker: I cannot get unanimous agreement.

ORAL QUESTIONS

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr B. Rae: My question is to the Treasurer. He will no doubt have seen the news and the survey that indicates what I think everybody living in this part of Ontario knows, which is that it is a very expensive place to live. What was not clear to people was just how expensive it is in comparison to literally every other city in the western hemisphere. Given that we now have objective information as to how expensive a place Toronto has become, I wonder if the Treasurer can explain why it is that a single person who is earning the minimum wage in Toronto today is still having to pay income tax to the Treasurer at the same time as the Treasurer is admitting that this person has to use a food bank.

Hon R. F. Nixon: The honourable member would know that the minimum wage here in Ontario is as high as any other in Canada and among the highest in North America. The fact that there is personal income tax payable is the same here as it is elsewhere, but I am sure he and his colleagues would applaud with some enthusiasm initiatives taken in recent budgets that direct taxation relief to families and towards the support of their children, particularly those who have disabilities and have to be cared for in the home. We believe that our taxation system is fair and equitable and that it continues to become fairer and more equitable.

Mr B. Rae: The fact of the matter is that this is not only a city for the rich and famous, this is also a city where people need to earn a living and be able to live. We now have the information that tells us just how difficult that is. I want to ask the Treasurer again, when we know this is the most expensive city not just in Canada, not just in Ontario, but indeed now in the entire western hemisphere, why would his government not be raising the minimum wage now in order to allow people to be able to begin to afford to live in this community? Why would he not be taking that step right now?

Hon R. F. Nixon: Since the honourable member has reiterated his question, I will say again that we have the highest minimum wage in North America, along with Quebec. We also have the best and most expensive health care system. We also have the best and most expensive education system. We have the highest level of social assistance of any jurisdiction in Canada. I believe that our accomplishments should be applauded, not criticized.

Mr B. Rae: The fact of the matter is the Premier of this province has gone around saying he wants to be the leader of a world-class place. I will tell members what he has got. He has got world-class poverty in this city; that is what he has got. He has got world-class food banks; that is what he has got. He has got housing that is too expensive for people to live in; that is what he has got. He has got people who are earning the minimum wage or below the poverty line who are still paying income tax to his government; that is what he has got.

I want to ask the Treasurer what he is going to do to make sure that this city is not only the most expensive and the most

inflated but also the most livable city in the western hemisphere. What is he going to do about that?

Hon R. F. Nixon: We are going to continue our enlightened and progressive programs, which the honourable member, if he were perspicacious, would certainly applaud. As a matter of fact, I was gratified to see that the non-political but knowledgeable people associated with the Daily Bread Food Bank were congratulatory, not about any political initiatives but about initiatives that have been supported by all members of the Legislature to improve the transferences to assist in housing and the provision of an adequate lifestyle for people on low incomes.

The honourable member would know that the utilization of food banks has decreased by 7%, which in his view may be irrelevant, and has decreased by 25% for those people who have been using the food banks and who have children. We think we are making substantial progress, we believe that the taxpayers are anxious to support this, and reasonable people are proud of that progress.

ACID RAIN

Mr B. Rae: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. The minister will know that most recently this House, in the standing committee on general government, had a hard look at the issue of acid rain abatement and dealing with acid rain. It was an interesting report because even the government's own members, even members of the Liberal Party, commented on the fact that there was no real planning as to what would happen after 1994. The minister knows full well that the planning for what takes place after 1994 in terms of continuing to reduce acid rain emissions has to be announced now. I want to ask the minister, where are the critical announcements on the reductions in acid rain which will take place after 1994?

1500

Hon Mr Bradley: As the member would be aware, Ontario has by far the most ambitious and aggressive anti-acid-rain program that exists anywhere in all of North America. One of the concerns that has been expressed, for instance, south of the border in the program that was announced, or at least being discussed, in Congress—both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives—was whether the rules and regulations would apply in perpetuity.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Bradley: I will make sure for the member for Hamilton West that all the industries that produce sulphur dioxide in Hamilton are appropriately looked after, and I know he will be very supportive of that.

We have indicated that regardless of how the economy would grow, how industrialization would grow in this province, there would not be an allowance for growth in the production of sulphur dioxide and the acid-rain-producing gases. I think we can anticipate as well that with the program we have implemented, not only will the four major polluters, which we have required to have about a two-thirds reduction by 1994, in fact meet that; I expect they will exceed that.

Mr B. Rae: I did not hear an answer to my question. Again, it is perhaps on a day like today when we reflect on our experiences here. I simply have not heard an answer to the question. I asked the minister very directly, where are the regulations that are going to give the House the assurance and

the people of Ontario the knowledge that we are going to see a continuation of a reduction in acid rain emissions post-1994, regulations that will apply not only to the Big Four in terms of their emissions but to all polluters? Where are the regulations that are going to assure this House that we will continue to see a reduction in acid gas emissions post-1994?

Hon Mr Bradley: As I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition in my initial response to the question, our limits, and the American program as well, are designed to reduce the SO₂ deposition to levels that will protect the resources that exist in this province, and I anticipate there will be further reductions.

Let me tell the Leader of the Opposition what is happening, for instance, in terms of Inco, which is the largest source at the present time in all of North America. At Inco, despite the fact that the member beside him shakes her head, I think she knows—

Mrs Grier: We didn't ask about Inco. We acknowledge what Inco's doing. We want to know what you are doing in excess of Inco.

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Bradley: Let me explain what is happening at Inco. The member will recall that when I initially announced these in December 1985, in fact what happened was many of the people who were subject to the regulations said: "It's not scientifically possible. It's not technically possible. And even if it were, we wouldn't have enough money to do so." Inco, which is the largest source, is making such drastic changes in its production at this time, as we specified in the regulation, that not only will it meet the regulated limit, but we will see significant further reductions as a result of the fact that instead of simply tinkering with the operation at Inco, it has made some significant strides in changing the entire smelting operation so that it will be significantly lower in its reductions.

Mr B. Rae: Can I conclude from the non-answers the minister has given to what I have asked him that in fact the government is not prepared now to table the regulations that will deal with reductions post-1994, reductions that will deal with all the polluters in the province? Can I therefore reach the conclusion from his answers that he has no such regulations in place and that in fact he has no such plans in place? Otherwise, surely now would be the time to be releasing them.

Hon Mr Bradley: It must be a slow day over there for the opposition to deal with one of my favourite subjects, that of acid rain, where in fact we remain the leader in all of North America despite what the member happens to say and where the efforts we have made in fact have had an impact south of the border so that they are following in our footsteps.

I can tell the member, for instance, when I look at Inco, which is the largest operation, where you have a 265-kilotonne limit, that in fact the goal being set is 175 kilotonnes, which is significantly lower than the regulated limit.

Right across the province of Ontario, a regulation exists for the purpose of lowering the sulphur content in all boilers that exist in the province. In addition to that, we will have a draft regulation which will affect all air contaminants, or potential contaminants, for public comment.

I think members will find once again that it is one of the most ambitious programs anywhere in the world—one, for instance, which in terms of percentage exceeds that of any New Democratic Party government that was ever in existence in all of Canada.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr Eves: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Upon checking with the Hospital Council of Metropolitan Toronto today, we found that some 1,597 hospital beds are currently out of service in Metropolitan Toronto. That is out of a total of 15,500. That is, in excess of 10% of the available hospital beds in Metropolitan Toronto are out of service. We know that the minister has said on several occasions in the House that beds are no longer the benchmark of health care in Ontario, despite the fact that her Premier, during the 1987 election campaign, promised to provide 4,400 more beds. How does the minister feel that these bed closures in Metropolitan Toronto and elsewhere in the province will affect the people of Ontario?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I would be very pleased to tell the member that on the advice of the Premier's Council on Health Strategy, whose work over the past two years has identified the enormous opportunities that new technologies are allowing in the provision of services in alternative ways, we accepted its recommendation to review our capital plan. We established a capital framework that acknowledged that we should focus on services, on the people rather than the name on the bed, and look at how those services could be provided in innovative and alternative ways, taking advantage of new technologies which have developed quite rapidly over the last two and a half years.

Mr Eves: I want to give the minister a specific example. It is an example that I alluded to in this Legislature on 24 April and again on 1 May. I never got a direct response to that particular situation or question on either of those dates, but I will take a chance on raising it again today, 9 May. That is the issue of the Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital. As was reported in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record yesterday:

"At least three suicides in Waterloo region in recent months are linked to a lack of beds at Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital, heads of the hospital's psychiatric department say.

"In a strongly worded document, which was dated April 24, the psychiatrists expressed concern about the devastating impact bed shortages have had on the psychiatric unit. 'The impact has been devastating. It has demoralized staff, it has placed on-call psychiatrists under tremendous stress and there have been three suicides that have been directly linked to the bed shortage.'"

What does the minister have to say about that? Does she disagree with that?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I would say to the member opposite that Ontario, as he should know, has one of the highest rates of institutional use of any jurisdiction in North America. In fact, that rate is a reflection of the outmoded and outdated policies of his party when it was in office.

Much service can be provided in alternative ways and in alternative locations. People can be provided services on an outpatient and ambulatory basis, and today people can be provided services in their home. The fact that he stands in this House day after day demanding institutionalization of people who do not want to be in institutions, who do not need to be in institutions and who would prefer to have the option and choice to have services provided in alternative ways shows how out of touch he is with the new directions and the realities of health in this province.

Mr Eves: If I were the Minister of Health, I would be ashamed to make that comment in light of the fact that three people who wanted to be institutionalized committed suicide because of her cutbacks, because they could not get treatment in

her institutions, despite the fact that her Premier, who is New York this afternoon, promised 4,400 new beds during the last election campaign and the minister has gone about and, through hospital budget cuts and limitations and elimination of deficits, cut 2,000. Now we are 6,400 beds behind where her Premier promised we would be in 1987.

There are currently over 15 people who have psychiatric problems waiting on similar waiting lists because of the shortage of beds in the Kitchener-Waterloo area, according to spokesmen at the Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital. Does the minister disagree with their expertise? Does she disagree with that hospital's demonstrated need for beds? I have asked the minister this question three times now. When is she going to give a straight answer to that specific question?

1510

Hon Mrs Caplan: Mr Speaker, I must correct the record. There have been no cuts in hospital budgets. Every hospital budget has increased in this province. This member opposite would suggest that a 10.7% increase in the Ministry of Health budget is a cutback. That is clearly ridiculous: \$6.6 billion for the hospitals of this province, an increase of 9.7%—

Mr Eves: I said cuts in deficit. Clean out your ears. You had better take the hair off your ears. You've eliminated the deficits and they have had to cut the beds. You don't have the guts to tell them.

Mr Kerrio: Apologize.

Mr Eves: You apologize, to the people who are dead. There is an apology needed all right, Vince—to the three people who are dead.

The Speaker: Order. Will the member for Parry Sound control himself or we might need more health care.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Mrs Marland: My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Actually, I have doubts whether we still have a Minister of the Environment, given the lack of environmental wisdom in recent announcements by his Liberal colleagues.

We have had the Environment ministry's budget cut by \$341 million because of the new water and sewer crown corporation. The money may go to sewers for suburban sprawl rather than cleaning up our waterways. We have heard about Project X and that it is still alive, and that tells us this government still wants looser environmental controls on land development. The Premier and the minister have sounded the death knell of the environmental assessment process by exempting all interim landfill sites for the Toronto area in terms of garbage from the Environmental Assessment Act.

Does this minister agree with these decisions, which put political expediency and short-term economic interests before the health of our environment?

Hon Mr Bradley: Look at the record of this government in the field of the environment and stack it up against any other jurisdiction in North America. Ask for independent observations, not something from a partisan person—and that is the member's role in the House, to play a partisan role, just as when I was in opposition it was my role and responsibility to be critical. If she was to get an evaluation from those who have observed her government when it was in power for a number of years, other governments in other jurisdictions and then this government, she would recognize that the environmental protection that is taking place in this province is almost unsur-

passed, that the kinds of programs we have embarked upon in this province are those which others would not dare to embark upon and that people in this province have found that we have aggressively dealt with so many of the issues that are of a historic nature and we are making some substantial progress.

All of us in this House want to make more progress. I am one of those people who does. But, for instance, when the member mentions the budget, the budget since this government has been in power has increased by over 100% in the field of the environment. This year it went up over \$100 million, some 22%, and sits now at \$649 million.

Mrs Marland: This minister would do well to listen to the evaluation of his government and his ministry in particular today by those people in this province who are concerned with the environment. The minister simply cannot back away from the tough questions by replaying the record of the past.

The Speaker: The question, please.

Mrs Marland: That was then and this is now. He cannot bask in his own record. All the decisions I just mentioned took place during his time as Minister of the Environment.

Let me remind the minister of another of his decisions that undermines the environment, the scrapping of the quota on refillable pop bottles. By allowing this in the name of recycling, the minister has taken another step backwards. He says pop can recycling is necessary to pay for the blue box program.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mrs Marland: My question is based on the fact that we all know many cans still end up in litter and in garbage bins. This minister knows that recycling cans is not as good for the environment as reusing bottles. Given his goals of—

The Speaker: Order. It is already the length of a member's statement, so would you place your supplementary.

Mrs Marland: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will. Given his goals of 25% diversion by 1992 and 50% by the year 2000, why is the minister ignoring the first two Rs—reduction and reuse—when recycling programs have only managed to reduce waste by some 14% at the most?

Hon Mr Bradley: Once again, this government in all of those areas has moved forward rapidly, much more rapidly and much more comprehensively than others.

Interestingly enough, this question comes from the member who was chastising me in the standing committee on estimates for dropping what is referred to as the fourth R. When I said that it should be reduction, reuse and recycling, I was questioned as to why I was dropping the other one, the one that she seems to like most, recovery—or at least at the time she indicated she was supportive of that. She got some calls between the time she started out and the next time we had a meeting, that said: "Don't you realize what you are saying? Don't you recognize what you are doing by asking where the fourth R is?" The fourth R is not a very popular one in the environmental field; so that was turned around.

We recognize that there are many ways of diverting waste. We are putting some \$55 million into the 3Rs this year. I recognize as well that this question about environmental assessment came from a member of the party that exempted the Darlington nuclear generating station, the Pickering nuclear generating station and the Bruce nuclear generating station.

Mrs Marland: This minister is being very unfair and inaccurate. He is repeating something, and fortunately the truth lies in the Hansard of the estimates committee. Four months ago I

asked him to confirm the comment that he has just repeated now, and I am very disappointed that he would repeat something that is not accurate. I think there are rules prohibiting that.

The Speaker: Do you have a supplementary?

Mrs Marland: This is based on the fact that the minister seems to have taken a back seat on all the issues involving the environment that are important to all of us, certainly the exemption of the garbage sites and the establishment of the water and sewer corporation, and the evidence is mounting that he was nowhere to be seen during the Hagersville tire fire.

My final question is this: What steps is he taking to ensure that decisions made by his colleagues are subject to strict environmental checks, so that the health of our children and the province they will inherit are protected?

Hon Mr Bradley: Of course, if the member knew about baseball, she would know that in this business you have to be not only a good pitcher but a good catcher. You recognize that when you have sat on both sides of this House.

In regard to the instances that the member has spoken to, for instance, we have in fact seen a huge increase in the budgetary commitment of this government to so many of the environmental initiatives that we have. The member, of course, likes to make reference to different things. If she wanted to find me during the Hagersville fire, she had to go to Hagersville. That is where I was: at Hagersville, not back in Toronto.

For the first time, the Premier of this province has placed the Environment minister of this province on the policy and priorities board of cabinet, the Management Board of Cabinet, the cabinet committee on economic and environmental policy and all other committees of cabinet. Therefore, there is an environmental input into all of the decisions that have been made by this government, which I think anybody in fairness—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon Mr Bradley: An independent, objective observer would certainly place a very high rating on the environmental record of this government, particularly in—

The Speaker: New question, the member for Hamilton East.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr Mackenzie: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. The minister will be aware that under the Occupational Health and Safety Act, regulation 692 on industrial establishments requires that a second person trained in the use of artificial respiration must be conveniently available when someone is working on live electrical equipment. For six years, Ontario Hydro has had a policy that in the case of electrical equipment of less than 350 volts a second person need not be available.

His ministry defends the Hydro policy in a 2 March 1990 memo given to Windsor representatives of CUPE Local 1000. Both his ministry and Hydro justify the policy saying that section 2 of regulation 692 allows for variance from its requirements. However, the equivalency section only allows for such variance in the case of the "composition, design, size and arrangement of any material object, device or thing."

Does the minister really believe that having a second person conveniently available to give artificial respiration can be considered an "object, device or thing" and that Hydro's policy is in line with the law of Ontario?

1520

Hon Mr Phillips: I know that Hydro and its union are extremely sensitive to safety issues. In fact, during the last round of negotiations, if I am not mistaken, just prior to the total contract being agreed upon, some major strides were made between the union and Hydro in the safety area, including some ground-breaking areas around the right to refuse unsafe work. So I would say that both the union and the company are extremely sensitive about safety.

I am not completely aware of the specific instance that the member is referring to but, knowing both the union and the company's track record, I would think that they would have examined it thoroughly and looked at the safety aspects. I know that our own inspectors work co-operatively with the employees and the employers to ensure safety, and I would hope that they have examined this matter thoroughly.

For the member who has now raised it, I would be happy to look further into it but, as I say, my experience with the company and the union is that they are both extremely sensitive about the safety issues.

Mr Mackenzie: The Ontario Hydro policy is a tragedy waiting to happen. Just last week I raised the case of Peter Casperson, who died by electrocution at Stelco in Hamilton. There was, unfortunately, no second person to give artificial respiration.

It appears that the main rationale for Hydro's policy is that much of the crown corporation's work is on equipment of less than 350 volts. What assurance will the Minister of Labour give Hydro employees, who are not happy about this, that he will enforce the existing law and not just be the servant of the largest crown corporation, Ontario Hydro?

Hon Mr Phillips: I guess I would repeat something I said earlier, and that is that I am aware of both the union's and the company's interest in health and safety. In the last round of negotiations, I know that was an issue of significant importance to both sides. There were some ground-breaking agreements made between the two parties in that area.

I would repeat what I said, that I would be happy to look into the specifics that the member has raised and just assure the members that the workers indeed do have the right, if they see a danger, to refuse to do that work. As we move into Bill 208, we will expand some of the protections for workers that will be of further assistance to them. I would hope and I would expect that no worker is being put at risk or danger and that both the company and the union would ensure that this in fact happens.

The Speaker: Before I recognize the next question, I am advised that the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues has a response to a question posed yesterday by the member for Burlington South.

MINISTRY MAILING

Hon Mrs Wilson: Yesterday, in response to a question, I committed to report to this House with regard to a mailing that went out from my ministry, from the Ontario women's directorate.

A Purolator courier picked up about 40 envelopes from the Ontario women's directorate last Thursday afternoon by mistake. All of those 40 envelopes were empty and were unsealed. They were in fact in the process of being prepared for a mailing which would have taken place this week. Upon my staff realizing that those envelopes had gone out in error, the courier company was telephoned and the mistake brought to their attention.

They in fact had realized that they had made the mistake. There will be no cost to the taxpayers of Ontario. The courier company has agreed to pick up whatever cost there may have been.

I would just repeat that those envelopes went out by mistake. The courier company has agreed to pick up any cost that have may have been made to them. There will be no cost to the taxpayers of the province.

Mr Jackson: I would ask the minister to continue her investigations. The groups that received these envelopes received them last week and she is informing the House that yesterday the courier picked up the envelopes. I would ask the minister to look into it.

Hon Mrs Wilson: Perhaps the member opposite misunderstood. The envelopes were in fact picked up by the courier last Thursday afternoon. It was Friday morning when the courier realized the mistake. Those envelopes were in the midst of being prepared for a mailing that would have taken place this week. In fact, they were picked up by the courier in error last Thursday.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr Jackson: I have a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues. Yesterday, in the House, the minister made a statement that her government was allocating \$2.2 million for expansion of shelters for victims of domestic violence. What was missing in the minister's statement was an acknowledgement that the federal government for two years had been offering the minister and her government over \$11 million for capital and operating grants in order to make the expansion of these badly needed shelter beds.

In her statement yesterday, the minister did include the following—I am quoting the press release—"I, as the minister, want to ensure that Ontario will stay a leader among provinces and territories in addressing the issue of wife assault."

How can the minister make a statement like that, which is to be considered quite clearly contradictory and inaccurate, in light of the fact that six provinces in Canada not only have received their money, but they have actually built the shelters and have victims already in them? Why is it that Ontario is the last province in all of Canada to access this fund, which has been available for two years? How can the minister make that contradictory statement?

Hon Mrs Wilson: This government is committed to ensuring safety for victims of wife assault. There are currently 81 transition houses for battered women and their children in this province. This government, as part of its long-term strategy to address the issue of wife assault, committed to first stabilizing funding to the existing shelters. I am confident that, with an increase in funding to those existing shelters of some 177%, their needs are well taken care of, their funding has stabilized and we are now ready to move into phase two of our strategy, which is to access the federal funds to build some nine new shelters in communities across the province not currently served by shelters for their battered women.

Mr Jackson: The truth is that this is not a social priority for this government; it is an election priority. Ontario is the last province in Canada to access this fund. Every government in Canada, including the federal government, has stated that this is a priority. The victimization in domestic violence is severe out there.

The fact is that there is something else the minister left out of her statement. She is putting up \$2.2 million; but

municipalities—in fact, nine of them in this province—will have to put up almost \$1.5 million in operating grants in order to make this a reality.

My question to the minister is this: If she is convinced that she is providing this national leadership—and she is the only one, I am quite convinced, who is convinced that she is providing it—if she is committed to expanding these beds as quickly as possible, will she announce today in the House which are the nine communities that will be expanded? Will the minister announce it today and not during an election? Will she prove that she is committed and tell us which are the nine communities?

The Speaker: The question was well put.

Hon Mrs Wilson: May I just make very clear that this government has developed a long-term, co-ordinated, comprehensive strategy to deal with the many issues that surround wife assault. The provision of shelter beds is one of the very important services which are part of that initiative. We have now used the federal funds, some \$7 million, from Project Haven.

Yesterday the member opposite was confused about that funding in thinking that in some way the province of Ontario was not accessing the full federal funds that are available. But I can assure the member opposite that this government will access every federal dollar that is available, some \$7 million from Project Haven. Combined with the operating funding from the province, we will provide some nine new shelters across the province.

We are reviewing with the Ministry of Community and Social Services right now the communities most in need of these services. Once those decisions have been made, we will be pleased to make those announcements. I know from the calls I received yesterday, communities across the province and Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Houses are very committed to the initiatives of this government and actually very—

The Speaker: Thank you. The member for Simcoe Centre with a new question.

1530

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr Owen: I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. In my riding of Simcoe Centre there are several major highways that carry heavy traffic from the Metropolitan Toronto area to cottage country throughout the warm months of the year and especially on weekends and holidays. Because at certain times of the year our highways become congested, the travellers turn to our county and township roads. What we are finding is that they are not respecting the slower-moving agricultural vehicles that are on the county and township roads. They start to compete with each other to use these other more-removed roads.

I am wondering if the minister could recommend any way of warning the drivers of the presence of the slower-moving agricultural vehicles. Are signs available? Can something be done before there is a serious accident?

Hon Mr Wrye: The honourable member asks a very good question because it is not an issue that is being faced in his riding alone. In fact, the Farm Safety Association has recognized the problem and has made plans to launch a province-wide billboard campaign, I believe, later this month on selected roads in mainly agricultural areas of the province. I am pleased to report to the honourable member that my ministry and the

Ministry of Agriculture and Food have jointly gone together to provide some of the funding for that billboard campaign. It is an issue that is an increasingly serious one in the province and we hope this billboard campaign will be able to partially address it.

Mr Owen: I have been approached by individual farmers about this problem and I have been approached by the Simcoe County Federation of Agriculture about it. They tell me that drivers simply do not know how to cope with the agricultural vehicles on the road. I am wondering if the minister could introduce some public awareness or maybe some driver training approach, either when they are taking their training or at the licensing stage. Can something be brought to the attention of these young people who are learning to drive that these vehicles are there and they also have a right to be on those roads?

Hon Mr Wrye: The honourable member knows, of course, that there is a slow-moving-vehicle sign and that indeed the issue is referenced in the Driver's Handbook. However, my officials have given me assurance that in the next revision of the handbook there will be some upgrading of the recognition of this, as the problem—as the honourable member and his constituents so correctly point out—is one that is growing and that we are concerned about.

The member for Simcoe Centre raises a good suggestion as well, that throughout some of the other offices of the ministry we might put together publicity material that might raise the awareness of new drivers, and indeed of all drivers, on this growing issue. It is certainly a very worthwhile suggestion and I will give the member a commitment that we will take a very careful look at it.

SAULT STE MARIE LOCKS

Mr Morin-Strom: I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The minister would know that the Sault Ste Marie locks are a vitally important tourist attraction and are of historical significance. In northern Ontario, the Sault locks in particular are vitally important to ensure that tourists from the American side, at the important crossing of Sault Ste Marie, do cross into Sault in Canada. They have historically been one of the two major tourist attractions in that area.

The Canadian locks have now been out of operation for more than two years. Efforts are under way involving the federal government and the private sector to put together a proposal to restore the Canadian Sault locks. I would like the minister to commit his ministry to supporting that and to being financially involved in ensuring that this important tourist attraction continues to be an important part of tourism in northern Ontario. Will the minister so commit his office?

Hon Mr Black: The member would be well aware of the fact that the Sault locks are the responsibility of the federal government. Having said that, we have met two or three times during the past few months with individuals from Sault Ste Marie who have a particular interest in getting the Canadian locks in operation again. The proposals I have looked at have been general proposals without any specific details attached to them, and at our last meeting I indicated to the representatives from the Sault with whom I was talking that when they had a specific proposal to make, we would be happy to meet with them and discuss it in more detail.

Mr Morin-Strom: The minister should know that formal proposals are being requested in the Sault area for redevelopment of the Sault locks and that it is anticipated developers will

be proposing a major tourist attraction be developed in conjunction with the lock. The federal government has committed some \$5 million to restoration and renewal of the lock itself. Would the minister commit to a comparable sum of funds from the provincial government to support a major private development tourist operation on the site of the Sault Ontario locks?

Hon Mr Black: Let me say to the member for Sault Ste Marie and to the people of Sault Ste Marie that this government has always been willing to look at things that promote tourism in the Sault area or in any other part of northern Ontario. We believe very firmly that we need more attractions in that part of the province and we are willing to look, as I have said, at any proposal that comes forward. However, I will not commit until I have had an opportunity to look at the details of such a proposal. I am sure the member would not want me to do that without giving it very careful consideration.

PRIVATIZATION

Mr J. M. Johnson: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is it the intention of the ministry to proceed with privatization of Liquor Control Board of Ontario stores by expanding the agency store concept and closing D stores?

Hon Mr Sorbara: The answer is no; once again, the answer is no.

Mr J. M. Johnson: I appreciate that on behalf of the many stores in rural Ontario, but the managers and employees are quite concerned that the ministry is cutting the stocks of the stores. It is my understanding it is reducing some of them by 50 per cent. If the ministry cuts the stock, it will also cut the sales. Then will the government use the excuse that they are no longer creating enough sales to warrant being kept open?

Hon Mr Sorbara: In politics as in everything else, there develops periodically a variety of urban rumours, and sometimes rural rumours, that just seem to pop up every now and again. I remember, when I was a kid, that the urban rumour about the government raising the driving age to 18 was there; everyone who was 15 years old heard that urban rumour. The privatization of the LCBO is yet another urban rumour.

The member for Wellington suggests that stock reductions are being made as a strategy to phase out stores. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Let me tell members the retail strategy of the LCBO; it is to ensure that every community is served as effectively as possible with two main points at the front of the priority agenda. The first is customer service, to have a wide range of products available that are desired in the community. The second is socially responsible distribution of beverage alcohol.

If a store needs to be expanded, it will be expanded as the community grows. Indeed, if a store is not the beneficiary of a lot of business, obviously in the fullness of time that store's stock would be reduced if products are not being bought, and if there is no business at all, the store would be closed.

The rumour about privatization is just that.

PART-TIME WORKERS

Mr Daigeler: My question is to the Minister of Labour. People in my riding are very interested in improving the benefits package for part-time workers. As the minister knows, many of these workers are women, and the lack of vacation or holiday time is especially hard on them, not to mention the fact that few part-timers share in company pensions or dental plans.

My question to the minister is this: Is he looking at this problem, and is he planning to address it in a comprehensive way as soon as possible?

Hon Mr Phillips: I appreciate the question because it is a matter of some considerable interest, I know, to the member. I think the first thing I would say is that we should be aware that a number of protections for part-time workers already exist in both the Employment Standards Act and our pay equity legislation. Some feel that the pay equity legislation does not cover part-time workers. In fact, it does. In our Employment Standards Act we cover minimum wage and vacation pay, and there are some pension benefits covered. Having said that, there are still some areas where part-time workers are not covered under our Employment Standards Act, on things like pay for public holidays and the benefits he speaks about.

In answer to his question, we are reviewing, as I have mentioned in the House before, the entire Employment Standards Act. We will be issuing a green paper this year on the Employment Standards Act, and one of the areas that I think all of us have an interest in is, should we be enhancing the protection available to part-time workers under that act? So two things: There are a number of things covered currently, and we are looking at additional areas.

1540

Mr Daigeler: I certainly look forward very much to the publication of this green paper. I understand the member for Beaches-Woodbine, I am sure, is equally interested in receiving this paper as soon as possible.

The claim is sometimes made that large companies are deliberately hiring part-time and seasonal workers to bypass having to pay benefit packages to their employees. Is there any evidence for this allegation, or is it more that the hiring of part-time workers relates to either personal working preferences or the economic climate that business faces?

Hon Mr Phillips: The members might be interested to know that about 15 years ago around 11% of our jobs in this province were part-time jobs. That number now is around 16%. So as the member has quite correctly pointed out, the numbers are increasing.

I think that is a function of several things. I understand about a third of these part-time employees are students. Our service sector is increasing quite significantly as a percentage of jobs, and it happens that there is a significant number of these part-time jobs in the service sector. In fact, a little more than 85% of our part-time jobs are in the service sector. I think there is some evidence as well that there are individuals who like to have the flexibility of not necessarily working full-time.

Those would be three reasons. I cannot rule out, although I do not know, the possibility that some organizations also look to part-time workers to provide them with cheaper labour costs. It is one of the concerns that was raised by the Treasurer in his budget, ensuring that as we look ahead in this province we have quality jobs. As I say, I cannot tell the member the specific reasons, but those are four things that may be contributing to it.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Mrs Grier: My question is to the Minister of the Environment. All across the province communities are preparing waste management plans and preparing themselves for environmental assessment hearings. There have so far been two landfill sites subject to environmental assessment under the Environmental Assessment Act, one in Halton and one in North Simcoe.

In the case of North Simcoe, a joint board rejected the application for a number of reasons and I would like to just quote to the minister two of the sentences from that decision. The board found "that the proponent's environmental assessment lacks the basic combination of reasonableness, consistency and systematic approach" and said, "An environmental assessment must not only come to a conclusion as to the suitability of the undertaking, but must also demonstrate how the proponent arrived at it."

Can the minister tell us whether he agrees with the decision of the joint board in that case?

Hon Mr Bradley: As the member would know, the matter comes to what is called the cabinet committee on legislation and a decision is rendered then. Since it is going through that appeal process at this time, I think it would be inappropriate for me to comment until such time as the cabinet has dealt with that appeal process.

Mrs Grier: My question was more directed to the generality of how subsection 5(3) of the Environmental Assessment Act is to operate, because I am sure the minister shares my concern and the concern of the people of North Simcoe that if in fact cabinet overturns this decision, it would be a travesty and an undermining of the Environmental Assessment Act.

I want to quote to the minister from a letter written by the member for London Centre when he was Leader of the Opposition and was commenting on an application for a landfill site in Saiford in the county of Oxford. He was opposing the intervention of the cabinet of the day and said, "It is a travesty of the system to have the hearing process with expert testimony overturned by politicians in cabinet who know very little about the issue."

Does the minister agree with the conclusions of his leader, now Premier, that politicians in cabinet who know very little about the details of the issue should not overturn decisions of a joint board?

Hon Mr Bradley: As the member knows, legislation in the province of Ontario provides for an appeal to cabinet of decisions of this kind, because ultimately they are the people who are elected and the people who must defend such positions, whatever the position might be in terms of an appeal. I suspect as well that although the member and I would, by and large, say that the decisions of boards should be sustained in principle, she would not want to be placed in a position where any decision at all made by a joint board was a decision that would finally stand. I think she would agree with the need for an appeal process.

I know that the legislation committee of cabinet carefully considers any and all matters that come to it, that it looks exceedingly carefully at all of the arguments that are marshalled on either side, and that ultimately a decision is rendered based on that. I can assure the member that whenever cabinet considers any appeal, that always takes place. Each and every member of the cabinet looks very carefully at all of these to determine what is most appropriate in terms of a final answer. The member knows that in a democratic system it is essential that be the case.

CAPITOL THEATRE

Mr Villeneuve: I have question for the Minister of Culture and Communications. In the Ministry of Culture and Communications' publication released today, *A Vision of Heritage*, the minister's goals are great: "To foster awareness that our heritage is vital...to strengthen provincial government

leadership in conserving Ontario's heritage; to empower Ontario's communities to undertake high-quality heritage conservation." Great statements. The Capitol Action Group in Cornwall will welcome these very much.

Is the minister aware that the Premier is totally ignoring requests to not destroy or dismantle the Capitol Theatre in Cornwall? Would she not, as a matter of principle and of provincial issue, commit the province to not building on or occupying the site of the Capitol Theatre if indeed it is torn down?

Hon Ms Hart: I thank the member for the opportunity to discuss the Capitol Theatre in Cornwall. The member may not be aware that I had a telephone call yesterday from two members of the committee he suggests, I believe. They were very concerned, as are others and particularly my colleague the member for Cornwall, that the local government perhaps is not fully appreciative of the fact that there are programs under the Ministry of Culture and Communications that deal with heritage and heritage preservation. In fact, they asked me to write a letter to the mayor and council to indicate that those programs are certainly available.

Having said that, I intend to carry through on that, but I would indicate to the member that I am very reluctant to interfere in a choice of what a community wishes to preserve and what it does not. It seems to me that the people living in the community are in the best position to know exactly what they would like to go to bat to preserve.

Mr Villeneuve: The minister may not be aware that on 15 June there is a hearing scheduled to look into the possibility of turning the Capitol into a national heritage site. Would she ensure in the correspondence that she sends to the mayor and council of Cornwall that she would like at least to protect this building until such time as these people have had a chance to look at and assess the possibility of leaving the building there, building the provincial building around it and using the facilities as part of a heritage structure that, I believe, the majority of the people of Cornwall want to see in place?

Hon Ms Hart: What I can say to the member opposite is that I and my ministry are very interested in heritage preservation, as he heard from the announcement today. I have said I will write the letter, and I will also indicate, as I am prepared to do to the member today, that my ministry and the government will do everything possible to assist the community in making its decision to preserve the Capitol Theatre.

1550

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr Kanter: I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services about efforts to save the reception class at Huron public school in my riding. This class provides support and security for children living at four transition houses near the school. The minister will recall that I wrote to him about this matter on 2 April and spoke to him about it several times subsequently. Can he advise whether ministry staff have had an opportunity to consult with various parties to look at options for continuing this program, which is very badly needed by the children at Huron public school?

Hon Mr Beer: I want to thank the honourable member for the question and also for his ongoing involvement in this particular issue. I am pleased to tell him that earlier this week a meeting was held with the Earls Court Child and Family Centre, Huron public school and other representatives with an interest

in this particular issue. We will be able to ensure, through the Earls court organization, that a child care worker will be available and that the program at the Huron public school will be able to continue next year.

I would like to thank all those who have been involved in this. We want to ensure that this kind of program can continue because it serves an extremely good purpose in assisting those children from the transition houses.

Mr Kanter: I would like to thank the minister for his investigation of this matter and for the very successful outcome, which is successful both for the children in the program and the community at large. I think this is an excellent example of a successful resolution of a community problem, not one that was caused by the minister or the ministry but, rather, one that was resolved by the ministry. I want to compliment the minister for his success in that regard.

However, could the minister explain for all interested members the importance of this type of program, which integrates different services to best assist children in transition houses?

Hon Mr Beer: I think it is important to recognize that during the discussion of this particular issue there were some problems that people were trying to wrestle with honestly and openly. It is because of that this particular program has been continued. What we recognize is so vital with this program is that it brings together a number of the organizations that are active in the children's services sector. Here we have a case of a school, a children's mental health centre, transition houses, social workers, all coming together within the school setting, and I believe this is the kind of approach we are going to see increasingly.

Members will recall that in the report of the select committee on education about a year or so ago one of the key recommendations was that we have to see within the school system more representatives from the health and social service sectors, and I think this is the kind of program that shows how that can work and work very well.

CHILD CARE

Mr R. F. Johnston: I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities. I presume the minister is aware that Seneca College has decided to close the Seneca lab school day care on its campus, thereby shutting down a facility that is of enormous importance to early childhood education students as well as to the people who go to Seneca College. As I understand it, this will be the first college without a day care facility on its campus as a result.

What kind of intervention will the minister make on behalf of his government to make sure that the same principle that applies for his elementary schools should apply to colleges as well, that child care should be available on those campuses, especially where we are actually educating early childhood educators?

Hon Mr Conway: I am aware of the situation at Seneca. It is my understanding that they are acting within their responsibilities. I was just looking for my note, Mr Speaker, and I can assure my honourable friend that my staff is reviewing the matter. Perhaps it would be prudent of me, since I cannot seem to locate my note, to simply take this as notice and get back to my honourable friend.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Mr Callahan from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr43, An Act respecting the City of Brampton;

Bill Pr63, An Act respecting the Victoria County Railway Company Limited;

Bill Pr72, An Act to revive Silayan Filipino Community Centre.

Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill Pr64, An Act to revive the Ontario Skeet Shooting Association.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

OTTAWA ARTS CENTRE FOUNDATION ACT, 1990

Mr Grandmaitre moved first reading of Bill Pr41, An Act respecting Ottawa Arts Centre Foundation.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to government notice of motion 30 on time allocation in relation to Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance.

The Speaker: Mr Runciman adjourned the debate. He is not here. The Minister of Financial Institutions.

Hon Mr Elston: It has been some time since we have been able to speak about this matter from this side of the House, and it is an important piece of legislation. There is no one in this chamber who can downplay the importance of this new initiative. There is among us none who would suggest that this is not a change in the way business is done with respect to insurance in the province of Ontario. There is none who would argue that there are substantial changes to be made and changes that have to be made if there is going to be a balance in terms of the benefits that are to be delivered to the victims of accidents at a price which is reasonable and responds to the needs of the consuming public of Ontario to have a product that it can afford to purchase. There is no question that the way people will now be able to shop for their insurance product will be different.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Elston: There is no question that the yammering from the member for Welland-Thorold will not cease, that he will try to barrack and prevent us from putting our points on the record, that after his 17-hour assault on the sensibilities of the province, of the members of the House and the assault on the democratic process of that member—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Will the member withdraw—

Mr Pouliot: My colleague is in line.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Would the member please withdraw that remark?

Mr Kormos: I did not make a remark.

The Deputy Speaker: Could the members please respect the standing orders? Do you have a point of order?

Mr D. S. Cooke: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would ask that the minister withdraw his comments whereby he indicated that my colleague the member for Welland-Thorold had been subverting the parliamentary and democratic system. That is implying motives. It is inappropriate. The discussion that he engaged in was most appropriate for the parliamentary system and it is not appropriate for the minister to put any label on that whatsoever or say that is not in line with the standing orders. He cannot use that kind of language, and I would ask you to ask him to withdraw it.

1600

The Deputy Speaker: Minister, did you use these words?

Mr D. S. Cooke: The minister cannot question his motives.

Hon Mr Elston: I was not questioning his motives. I identified the fact that there is an assault on the democratic process.

Mr Speaker, I will withdraw anything that offends the honourable gentleman across the way. I do not want to get engaged in this and hold up the debate as they have done in the last while. I will withdraw the things that irritate the gentleman, even if they are true.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Would members please calm down. Minister, did you use these words; yes or no?

Hon Mr Elston: I will withdraw whatever it is that offended them.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I am not going to play games with this. He said that he withdrew them and then he said, "Even if they are true." He cannot question the motives of my colleague the member for Welland-Thorold.

The Deputy Speaker: In that case, Minister, would you please withdraw these allegations.

Hon Mr Elston: I withdraw.

I will identify the fact that I have been prevented from speaking to this issue now for fully more than a month in this Legislature, and I cannot but think that is unfair, that in fact it is not the intention of the chamber to prevent the minister or any member of the government party from putting forward a balanced and weighed vision of the legislation.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have been trying all along to get the members to respect the standing orders when any member is speaking. It does not matter who is speaking; I want the standing orders respected, please.

Hon Mr Elston: We have a continuation of a discussion which started more than a month ago. I have not been able to put my points on the floor of the House, even though there have been outrageous claims made by the two members who have spoken, one from each of the official opposition party and the

third party, outrageous claims about what has occurred with respect to the members of this party.

The fact that the member vilified the activities of the members who sat as government members on the committee was something that in fact I have not before seen in this House in the manner displayed, and he asked me to withdraw some indication that I thought it was not an appropriate use of this forum in the manner that he has used this forum. I find that very difficult to accept.

I find it equally difficult to accept that I have had to listen, over the last two or three days, to all of the interventions of the member for Leeds-Grenville where he indeed attacked the individuals who sat as government members on the committee, fairly being present to listen to the presentations that were being made by concerned people who came in front of the committee, and they listened with patience. They were available to be attentive to the questions which were put to the individual witnesses.

That some of the questions and some of the interventions of the representative of the official opposition were, by any measurement, unusual, to use a kind phrase, is clear by reading the Hansard. Some of the things that were said about the witnesses by the member for Welland-Thorold were not only unkind but were uncalled for.

In this building we have a code of conduct which was not and has not been upheld. This has not become a place where we can put our points and counterpoints in a way which would allow the people of the province of Ontario to weigh the differences of opinion that we hold. I do not for a moment try to tell people in the province that there are not people who disagree with me. People will disagree with the initiatives of government, people will disagree with the interjections from the official opposition, people will disagree with the member for Sarnia who, as interim leader, has so well led his party. That is the nature of our business.

We have a duty, however, to move in a manner in which the points can be placed and can be answered. Yes, some people will not agree that the answer is as full or as complete as they may wish to have, but that is no reason why an important piece of legislation, with important principles and with important objectives, brought in front of the Legislative Assembly, should be held without debate, without resolution over more than a month.

The process in this House is well known. We have first reading, second reading, committee, committee of the whole if required, and it is not always required. In fact, it is not often required to come back to committee of the whole House for bills, then to go into third reading.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Elston: It is highly unusual to have the types of speeches that were engaged in when committee of the whole started to hear again the first sections of a bill which had been in committee between the adjournment of the House and the recalling of the House, between January and February.

It seems to me that when we started out with section 1, the member for Welland-Thorold asked his first pertinent question, like—the people will probably be able to read it in Hansard for themselves—"What is an accountant?" After that particular section had been addressed in full, and in fact 56 other sections had been addressed in full and covered in debate and had issues resolved in front of the committee before it came back here, his action was very clear to everybody. He had no intention of

moving the debate forward. In fact, that was well described by his colleague the member for Algoma when he said they had one objective and that was to prevent this bill from being passed.

I do not disagree with the fact that the members from the loyal opposition have a point of view about requiring the government, in their view, to have only public ownership of the insurance industry. They are fully entitled to their view. It is a view to which the Liberal Party does not subscribe and we have a difference of opinion. But when there were differences of opinion, even in their own caucus, the interventions such as we were sustaining here in this House would not have been tolerated by a reasonable chairman in their caucus meetings. They would not have allowed the person to go on without allowing somebody else in their own caucus to debate the issues that they have to deal with. I cannot believe for a moment that they do not disagree internally and I do not believe for a moment that they think they can come into this House and hold up the debate on the bill and prevent it from being passed just because they do not agree with us.

There is no question but that these people really are not happy with the legislation. I admit that and I admit to the people of the province of Ontario that there are individuals in this province and people who are members of associations in this province who do not agree with the way in which we have put this bill together. But let me assure the people in Ontario that this was not a piece of legislation that came together lightly; the decisions about the balance required were not taken on the moment. In fact, the deliberations took place over weeks and months as we examined all of the material that came forward.

We did not have to just examine the presentations from the Committee for Fair Action in Insurance Reform, as perhaps the opposition paid more attention to. They did not have to go through all of the presentations in the manner we did. They did not have to survey all of the material that was brought forward. They have relied upon their favourite pieces, and that is okay because it allows them to make their points, but they do not fully explain the entire process to people.

1610

For instance, the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale makes great volume about the minister not being in committee. As long as I have been in this House, it has been appropriate for the parliamentary assistant to the minister to attend the committee. I happen to have a very good assistant in the member for Guelph, well able to put forward the arguments in a rational and sensible fashion while able to represent the government of this province in a way in which all of us are proud. There is not anybody who questions the ability of that member to be able to represent the position of the government on this bill and he has done so with reason and with integrity.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Elston: What was it the opposition did? They tried to make the point that there was no provision, or at least they allowed the inference to be taken from their remarks that there was no provision, for the minister to be represented in committee and somehow it was inappropriate for me to be represented by my parliamentary assistant. That is not true. The way this government works is that there is a sharing of the responsibilities among all of the people in our caucus. We work well together and we share in the workload, and I am proud to

be able to call the member for Guelph my assistant and, in fact, one of my closest and best colleagues in this House.

I am proud to say that, despite the interventions from the member for Leeds-Grenville, I am very proud indeed of the manner in which the Liberal members on the committee received and entertained the representations of the witnesses in front of the committees. The types of comments that we had to listen to were, in my view, not appropriate. If I had more time—and we run short of time even in today's schedule because of special circumstances—I would have gone, item by item, over the contributions of each of the members of our committee, just to take exception to the types of reviews which were given by the member for Leeds-Grenville.

You might have noted, Mr Speaker, that he held a sign up here the other day in the House which had "Chris Ward" on it. That sign identified the member for Wentworth North, and I can tell you, Mr Speaker, that I have nothing but the highest regard for the member for Wentworth North. He and I have worked together in this House for more than five years now, and he has shown an exceptional ability to carry on the business of the government with dispatch. I cannot for a moment countenance the types of interventions that came to us from that member.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Elston: Those interventions perhaps had a purpose. I do not know, nor will I give to any of them the time which I would have liked, but perhaps they were merely made so that we would have a longer speech. Perhaps the member for Leeds-Grenville, for whom I have a great deal of admiration at times, would come and apologize to our members after the fact. I cannot believe that he would hold personally the types of representations that he made in the manner that they were made.

Let me talk about the no-fault legislation, Mr Speaker. We have been talking about the no-fault legislation since I first made it public in September 1989. It was introduced in the House in October 1989. We talked about it on second reading. In fact, it went out to committee in December 1989. It went into committee and stayed in committee from December 1989 until the middle of February 1990.

We visited a number of communities around the province. We heard representations from a number of people who talked about their concerns with the bill. In fact, although there are some who would say there was nobody there who supported us but the insurance industry, that of course is not the case. There are people who are identified in Hansard; there are individuals who showed at the committee that they supported the concept. They may have had disagreements with one particular point here or another particular point there in the entire program, but, in balance, they would support the program, and in fact they have made some suggestions about change which we accepted.

We did not change the threshold. The member for Welland-Thorold would be concerned that we change the threshold, but we have not changed the threshold. But we did change the weekly benefits from \$450 to \$600. We did change the monthly allotment available for long-term care to \$3,000 per month. We did take into consideration the fact that some people thought that our threshold was perhaps too strict.

But when we took a look at all of the material which was available for us, we had to make the balanced decision. We had to make the decision that there was value for the money that the people were paying, that in fact the people could afford to pay for the product.

It makes no sense for those individuals to say that we were in committee without support. It is not true. There is not unanimous support for this legislation; I agree with that. Why is there not unanimous legislation? There is not unanimous legislation because we changed substantially the way that we do business for auto insurance in the province of Ontario. There will be a reduction in the use of the courts, and that is clear, I do not dispute that at all. But in terms of the amount of dislocation that is caused by this new legislation, we perhaps will have to take with a grain of salt some of the predictions that they have made in the opposition party.

I am clearly of the view that we must go forward with this legislation in a timely fashion. We have already seen a substantial amount of time slip by while some members spoke at length.

I want to ensure that we have the understanding in the province that this is not by itself just a bill that deals with auto insurance; that it does not just deal with no-fault benefits, which are at the level of \$600 per week, tax-free; that it is not just a reimbursement for child care costs, at \$50 per child per week for a limit of four; that this is not just an increase in the benefit for supplementary medical and rehabilitation insurance costs; that this is not just a bill which allows for the introduction, for the first time ever, of long-term care under no-fault benefits; but that this bill goes further and provides benefits, for the first time, on a weekly benefit basis for seniors, for students, for the unemployed and for the unpaid homemaker.

In that latter category, before, there was some \$70 a week allocated for the individual who did not work for remuneration outside the home. We have increased that to say that they should be treated better. We have increased the benefits in the sad case where there are deaths occurring. The death benefit has been increased and funeral expenses have been increased. Unfortunately, those items must be addressed, because we recognize that inevitably we will have to deal with the problems that come from the most severe of those accidents.

For the most severely injured in this province, there is no change. Those people will be able to go to the courts of this province and be able to seek relief as they now do, with one important exception: Instead of trying to subsist on a paltry \$140 per week as they process their litigation through the courts, they will have \$600 a week or whatever it is they are reimbursed for their earned wages; they will have long-term care available, if that is required; they will have supplementary medical, and they will have rehabilitative costs paid. They will be sustained in a way which will allow them to prosecute their litigation to the fullest. We have a much fairer plan here than was the case before.

When those people objected about moving from the system that we now have, did any of those people bring forward the cases in which people were disadvantaged? They refuse to acknowledge that there are dislocations. They were not even able to come forward and identify the fact that the no-fault benefits have been universally seen in this province as too low. They have not come forward to indicate that there are people in this province who have been disadvantaged by the process in front of our courts.

1620

People have been disadvantaged under the tort law system, make no mistake. There have been individuals who have been injured severely in this province and have not been able to recover. There have been people who recovered amounts of money that were then taken and applied to costs associated with

litigation, associated with the recovery, and ended up with virtually nothing.

Those problems were not identified by the people. They left the impression that there were no problems to be addressed under our tort law system. They left the impression that there was a Utopia from which we were moving. It is not the case. That is what they tried to make people believe, and they spoke at length, much too long, about all the good attributes of the current system, without balancing it against the people who had been disadvantaged, without telling people the full story and without telling people that there was, through no-fault benefits, a better system at hand.

I think I would feel more difficult about putting this program forward if there was no way that a resolution to disputes for those less seriously injured people could be addressed. There will be a forum when there is disagreement about those people who receive no-fault benefits and the level at which they are given. They will not have to go to the courts, because there will be mediation and arbitration established under the provisions of the legislation which comes forward here. There will be a quicker resolution of the difficulties between company and insured. There will be an independent commissioner who will act with dispatch to allow resolution in an inexpensive forum of disputes about the moneys owing and there will be an independent commissioner who will act on behalf of the consumers to institute the very new and firm consumer protection laws that are covered in this bill.

Did the people over there, in mounting opposition, in their day-after-day debate—what they called debate—talk about the consumer protections that are in this bill? No. And do members know why? They did not want to provide the balance that is required to give a reasonable assessment of this legislation.

They spent a lot of time talking about the fact that the Treasurer of this province and this government no longer will tax the premiums which are to be paid by the drivers of the province. The current method is to put 3% on top of the premium that is charged to the driver. That money is then passed through to the consolidated revenue fund. That will not happen any more. Under the auspices of this, the premium tax will not be charged, and that is reasonable. Anything we can do to provide a more reasonable-cost product I think is an initiative worth taking.

We are not just dealing here with auto insurance. The people do not talk about the other initiatives which are also accompanying this piece of legislation. They are not talking about the reform to the tort system to allow a more reasonable method of resolving disputes with respect to interest to be charged prejudgement or the process that is to be streamlined, as the Attorney General has done. He had two pieces of legislation passed last October.

They have not talked about the initiatives against drunk drivers. They have not talked about the initiatives we have taken to reduce speeding on the highways. They have not talked about the initiatives that we have implemented to allow safer use of our highways in the very busy areas of this great province.

I would like to have spoken at length about those. I would like to have talked about the fact that we will allow persons who have a bad driver in their family to exclude that driver from the use of their vehicles and, as a result, pay not for the bad driver's record but pay premiums on the basis of their own driving record. I would like to have gone through a whole series of items, but I have been prevented from addressing those.

I have not been able to pursue the right that I have to answer the questions which have been levelled against us by the member for Welland-Thorold and by the member for Leeds-Grenville. I would love to have provided the answers, because we have the balanced answers. We have replies, but we saw in the beginning of the debate in committee of the whole House a concerted effort not only to slow down the debate but to prevent it.

All they have to do is go to the remarks of the member for Algoma. He made it clear in this House as the member for Welland-Thorold embarked upon his first few sentences, virtually, that they were going to do everything in their power to prevent the passage of this bill, and in fact that representation made in this House by that member confirmed and verified what was said outside the House by any number of those New Democrats who said this is, in their view, not the way to go.

They want to have a nationalized insurance industry. Nothing is better than the public ownership of almost every means of production as far as they are concerned. They do not talk about that as much as they used to because they are looking for new platforms, more balance, but that is where they are. They want to have a public system, and that is okay. That is okay for the socialists, but that is not what we have in this place. In this bill we have chosen another option, which we think is balanced and which provides us with the best benefits and the best relief under the circumstances.

We have gone on and on in this House about the various concerns, about being unable to process other legislation. There are problems associated with the long debate on this, because it holds up other important initiatives that this government has in mind.

It seems to me that when we come to the end of the day, people will find this a reasonable, balanced approach. When you couple the insurance bill, Bill 68, with the initiatives dealing with consumer protection, motorist protection through Ministry of Transportation, protections and initiatives that are sought through the introduction of enforced speeding laws by the Ministry of the Solicitor General, by seatbelt enforcement and other things, the people will see that this is a comprehensive program to deal with the real problem, which is the increased accident rate.

We cannot feel successful if we are unable to remove, as much as possible, the difficulties of driving on our roads. We must reduce the accident rate. Unfortunately, we recognize that there will be some accidents, and this is a balanced approach to making sure that we can help those people who are really disadvantaged by the accident result.

I am sad that we were unable to engage in real debate as we came to committee of the whole House. I am saddened that I was unable to reply to the questions which were brought forward. I am saddened that the members of the Liberal Party were unable as individuals to reply to the types of allegations which were made by the two opposition parties in an unfair and unreasonable manner, because they are reasonable, honest, decent people.

Mr D. S. Cooke: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The minister is indicating that he would like to have heard from more Liberal members during this debate. I can speak on behalf of my caucus and I think the Tory caucus would agree that we would, by unanimous consent, agree to listen to the member for Windsor-Walkerville on this important issue.

The Speaker: I cannot see any point of order. The minister may continue.

Hon Mr Elston: Again they play games—anything they can do to extend the time, anything they can do to waste time they stand up and grandstand about, and they barrack and heckle. They try to prevent us from putting the balanced view, but the time has come to move forward.

There is a great deal of information to be given to the people of the province. There is a great deal of work to be done to implement a fair system for the people of the province. There is a great deal of work to be done to get the results of this introduction of this bill, which is to find that, on average, increases for premiums in areas outside the large urban centres will be zero and inside the urban centres, on average, 8%. When they talk about some people receiving high increases, they forget to tell the people that when there is an average, there will be people who get decreases, decreases to match.

1630

There is not any question that a new system will require adjustment for everybody who is in the system. But for those people to hold on to the hope that they will frustrate for ever the introduction of this legislation is not reasonable. It is not reasonable in the system in which we find ourselves. I think it is time for us to move forward. It is time for us to deal in a rational manner in committee of the whole.

We could have spent more time in those places if those people had spoken reasonably. But we knew what they were doing, and there is no question that when the people read the Hansard of the 17-hour stretch when the member for Welland-Thorold was in full flight, they will know that there was not one very helpful contribution made by him through those full 17 hours, that it was a grandstand. We know what he was trying to do, and he was applauded by his colleagues for doing it. In fact, I applaud his stamina. I do not necessarily agree with what he was saying, but his stamina was really very unexpected. I did not expect him to be able to go for 17 hours.

But it is time that we move forward. At this time, in accordance with standing order 45, I move that this question be now put.

Mr D. S. Cooke: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think it would come as no surprise that there would be a point of order on a closure motion, on an attempt by the Liberal Party to shut down the debate on the most important amendments to the Insurance Act and the way car insurance is provided.

Mr Speaker, I think in order for you to look at this matter—and closure is not a motion that is used very often in this Legislature—to make a ruling on this motion, whether or not it is in order, you must look at the history of how this insurance bill has been dealt with by the government and how at each stage—

The Speaker: No, no. Order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Mr Speaker, there is a point. If you will not listen to that aspect of it, then I will refer to whether the closure motion today is in order. I mean, you should at least—

The Speaker: Order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Mr Speaker, I am going to be heard on this. You are not going to shut me down like that. There is a point of order on the closure motion and you are obliged to listen to my point of order.

The Speaker: I appreciate that and I know that the member is aware of the standing orders—

Mr D. S. Cooke: Darn right.

The Speaker:—I am going to, in very short term, read the standing orders so all members are aware. I have accepted a point of order, but I am not going to listen to debate.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I do not intend to debate it, Mr Speaker, but I do intend to point out to you how this bill has been debated and dealt with by the government. I am not going to speak at length on this point of order at all, so I would appreciate it if you would simply listen to me. We listened to the crap from the minister this afternoon.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I think we have an opportunity to respond to a closure motion.

When this bill was introduced in the fall of last year, it was the government's intention to ram this bill through the Legislature and have it passed without public hearings by 31 December. We then negotiated—

Hon Mr Elston: No, no. You can't give a history.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Mr Speaker, I will not be speaking at length. This is all on the closure motion.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Mr Speaker, I do not intend to sit down. I am only going to be five minutes on this and I think that you could relax and listen to a point of order on a closure motion.

The Speaker: Well, please keep your comments as close as possible—

Mr D. S. Cooke: They will be. I told you, they will be five minutes, for God's sake.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Look, really. Order. Will you take your seat, please.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I feel I am showing respect to the House by offering you the opportunity. I wanted to read so that all members, and you as well, are aware of what the standing order says. In case others have not, I would like to read it:

"A motion for closure, which may be moved without notice, until it is decided shall preclude all amendment of the main question, and shall be in the following words: 'That this question be now put.' Unless it appears to the Speaker that such motion is an abuse of the standing orders of the House or an infringement of the rights of the minority, the question shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment and debate. If a motion for closure is resolved in the affirmative, the original question shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment and debate."

I recognized the member on a point of order, and I presume the point of order is trying to assist me to make a decision, so I will listen to the member briefly.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I do not mean to get angry, but this has been a long debate on this issue, an important debate on this issue, and tempers have certainly flared over the course of the last couple of months. So I apologize, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, I just simply ask you to look at the history of how this legislation has been dealt with in the last few months, because I think it is relevant. The legislation was introduced in

the fall. It was the intention of the government to complete the debate on the legislation with no public hearings by 31 December of last year. It was only because the opposition parties insisted that there be public hearings across the province that there were a few weeks of public hearings across the province. That is the only way it was achieved. Even at that point, the public hearings were very restricted and, I would say, were not full public hearings in the way that we have public hearings around this place on important legislation like this.

Then, when the legislation was reported back to the Legislature on the first day that we returned for the resumption of this session, we were in committee of the whole for two days and the government then introduced its time allocation motion, which has been debated since. The reason that time allocation motion has been debated at length is because it is absolutely clear that the majority in the Legislature was trying to shut down debate on the insurance bill after only two days in committee of the whole.

I think that is a relevant fact for you to take into consideration, Mr Speaker, that we have only had a few days on second reading. We had a few weeks of public submissions. It was not debate among the committee members; it was public submissions. The government may not seem to think it is relevant, but we do. Then the committee reported back, we had two days in committee of the whole and the government tried to shut down the procedure with a time allocation motion that says two days in committee of the whole and one day of third reading. That, in itself, I think is a complete abuse of the democratic process in the Legislature.

Now, after trying to make that point to the government, through a lengthy debate and through all the tricks that took place by the government in the process of having late-night sessions when commitments were made that there would not be late-night sessions, we have come to this point: Yesterday, there was an amendment put forward by the member for Leeds-Grenville and that amendment was an honest attempt by a member of the opposition to start to lay the groundwork for coming to a consensus of how this legislation would be dealt with. There had been no initiative by the government over this period of time to try to negotiate an adequate amount of time to be dealt with in committee of the whole and at third reading. I congratulate the Conservative Party and the member for Leeds-Grenville for putting forward a constructive suggestion of how this legislation could be dealt with without having to use closure.

Now, at the first opportunity the government has to respond to that constructive proposal, closure is moved. My colleague the member for Welland-Thorold and other members of our caucus have not had the opportunity to respond to that constructive proposal. I saw yesterday as a real breakthrough for the government. The member was obviously trying to come to a common ground of how the legislation should be dealt with from this point on, but the government rejects that, throws it in the opposition's hands and says, "To hell with you, we're going to move closure."

Mr Speaker, I think what you should suggest, as the presiding officer in this Legislature, is that the House leaders should get together, use the proposal that the member for Leeds-Grenville has put forward and negotiate a mechanism whereby the legislation could be dealt with. The groundwork has been set in the proposal and therefore I think there is some common ground whereby that can be achieved.

The other thing is, I feel very strongly that when this amendment was put forward, while the government does not want to talk about a constructive plan to deal with this legisla-

tion, we do; and we should have an opportunity to speak on this amendment. Therefore, I believe the closure motion is out of order.

1640

Mr Eves: On the same point of order, Mr Speaker—and I will just try to make my remarks as brief and as on point as possible—I would echo the comments made by the member for Windsor-Riverside with respect to the amount of time that is purported to be allocated by the government's time allocation motion, two days in committee of the whole, with respect to this. This is a very significant piece of legislation, as the minister and everyone who has participated throughout this process over the past few months admits and realizes.

Yesterday, at approximately 5:50 pm, the member for Leeds-Grenville moved what I think is a very constructive and positive solution to the dilemma that faces this Legislature. I am quite frankly kind of surprised that the members on the government side would not just simply choose to adopt this as a way out of what has been an impasse in this Legislature for several weeks now. Eight days in committee of the whole on a piece of legislation as significant as this surely is not unreasonable. It is a very reasonable, positive approach to resolving a very real problem that we have with respect to this particular piece of legislation, eight days as opposed to two days proposed by the government itself. It is not a ridiculous amendment. It could have said two years; it could have said two months; it could have said 16 weeks. It does not say any of those things; it says eight days.

The amendment was only moved less than 24 hours ago in this Legislature. The only people in the Legislature who have had an opportunity to even address the amendment are the member for Leeds-Grenville himself, who moved it, and the minister, who has spoken for approximately 35 or 40 minutes in the Legislature this afternoon. Correct me if I am wrong—I was not here for his entire debate—but I do not think he has addressed the amendment that was moved by the member for Leeds-Grenville.

I would respectfully suggest to you, Mr Speaker, that before you rule the closure motion to be in order, the very least that members of this Legislature are entitled to is to have a representative from each one of the three parties address the amendment that was made yesterday by the member for Leeds-Grenville. That makes abundant sense to me.

If the government representative, namely the minister, has chosen not even to address what I think is a very positive and reasonable amendment, so be it. He has had his opportunity. He decided not to do that. He decided to move closure instead. He is not interested in a reasonable solution to a very real problem which he has had, along with other members of this Legislature, really for several weeks now.

But the very least that should happen here, in my respectful opinion, is that closure should not be invoked until the members of the third party and the official opposition, the members of the New Democratic Party of Ontario, have at least had the opportunity to speak to the amendment that was moved less than 24 hours ago. They have not even had a chance to address that amendment. I think to allow closure without their even having that opportunity is a very wrong precedent indeed to be set in this House. Does that mean that, with closure motions from here on in, we only have to hear from two out of three parties and the third party is left out in the cold? I do not think that is a very good precedent to set.

So I would respectfully ask you to consider that and to consider the amendment, and I think it is a very appropriate, responsible and reasonable amendment, that was moved by the member for Leeds-Grenville yesterday.

Hon Mr Ward: Mr Speaker, this motion we are dealing with today and have been dealing with for some time now has been the subject of in excess of 48 hours of debate. It has been before this Legislature for 16 days, and I would point out to you, sir, that over the course of the past several months the subject matter which this motion refers to has been before this House for some 42 days.

I think it is very important to note that no other business has been before this House since this session began. I think it is important to note that, prior to the introduction of the time allocation motion, some 26 members had spoken to this bill, in some 104 hours of debate. The fact of the matter is that, as has been quite eloquently put by the Minister of Financial Institutions, at some point the issues of the day have to be decided by the elected members of this Assembly.

Mr Speaker, I know that you have a very onerous obligation in your capacity to protect the rights of the minority in this Legislature, and I would say to you that you have done that very, very consistently. But I would also point out the comment made by you on 23 January 1989, when ruling on another time allocation motion. You stated that, in your opinion, the motion to curtail debate did not infringe upon the rights of the minority. You stated that in protecting the rights of the minority you must not lose sight of the rights of the majority. Through a 40-hour filibuster, I believe that the rights of the majority have been very much infringed upon over the course of the past several weeks.

Mr Speaker, I will say to you that it gives us no comfort to have to resort to what clearly is the most drastic method a government has in terms of getting important questions of the day put. I would say to you that we have been patient and you have been patient and I would suggest that given the comments made by members of the opposition during the limited time we had for committee of the whole House, it was clearly indicated by member after member that there was no intent to allow the debate to move forward, there was only an intent to obstruct the passage of the bill. So I would say to you that your obligation is of course to rule on this point of order and I ask that you do so judiciously.

The Speaker: I appreciate representatives from all parties assisting me in my decision. First of all, I want to accept the apology from the member for Windsor-Riverside. I did hear a message from the member for Parry Sound requesting the government to withdraw the motion, as I understood the suggestion, and I did not hear any response to that question.

Having read the standing order a brief time ago, and again reading it while I was listening, in my view this is not an abuse of the standing orders, as the members have had ample time for debate, and therefore I find the motion in order.

So the first question I put will be the question by the Minister of Financial Institutions. The minister moved that the question be now put.

1719

The House divided on Mr Elston's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes—57

Ballinger, Black, Bossy, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Campbell, Carrothers, Chiarelli, Collins, Conway, Cooke, D. R., Daigeler, Eakins, Elliot, Elston, Epp, Faubert, Fawcett, Fontaine, Fulton, Furlong, Grandmaître, Haggerty, Hart, Kanter, Kerrio, Kozyra, LeBourdais, Leone, Lipsett, Lupusella, Mancini, Matrundola, McGuigan, McLeod, Miclash, Miller, Morin, Neumann, Nixon, J. B., Oddie Munro, Owen, Pelissero, Poole, Ramsay, Ray, M. C., Reycraft, Roberts, Smith, D. W., Smith, E. J., Sola, Velshi, Ward, Wilson, Wong, Wrye.

Nays—20

Allen, Bryden, Charlton, Cooke, D. S., Eves, Grier, Hampton, Johnson, J. M., Johnston, R. F., Kormos, Mackenzie, Marland, Martel, McCague, McLean, Morin-Strom, Philip, E., Pouliot, Villeneuve, Wildman.

The Speaker: Mr Ward has moved resolution 30:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or special order of the House in relation to Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance, two sessional days shall be allotted to consideration of the bill in the committee of the whole House. All amendments proposed to be moved to the bill shall be filed with the Clerk of the assembly by 5 pm on the first sessional day on which the bill is considered in the committee of the whole House. At 5:45 pm on the second of these sessional days, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved and the Chair of the committee of the whole House shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto and report the bill to the House. Upon receiving the report of the committee of the whole House, the Speaker shall put the question for the adoption of the report forthwith, which question shall be decided without amendment or debate.

That one further sessional day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill. At 5:45 pm on such day, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further amendment or debate.

That in the case of any division relating to any proceedings on the bill, the division bell shall be limited to five minutes.

1755

The House divided on Mr Ward's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes—56

Ballinger, Black, Bossy, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Campbell, Carrothers, Chiarelli, Collins, Conway, Cooke, D. R., Curling, Daigeler, Eakins, Elliot, Elston, Epp, Faubert, Fontaine, Fulton, Furlong, Grandmaître, Haggerty, Hart, Kanter, Kerrio, Kozyra, Leone, Lipsett, Lupusella, Matrundola, McGuigan, McLeod, Miclash, Miller, Morin, Neumann, Nixon, J. B., Oddie Munro, Owen, Pelissero, Poole, Ramsay, Ray, M. C., Reycraft, Roberts, Smith, D. W., Smith, E. J., Sola, Sweeney, Velshi, Ward, Wilson, Wong, Wrye.

Nays—19

Allen, Bryden, Charlton, Cooke, D. S., Eves, Grier, Hampton, Johnson, J. M., Johnston, R. F., Kormos, Mackenzie, Marland, Martel, McCague, McLean, Morin-Strom, Philip, E., Villeneuve, Wildman.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Mr Ward: Pursuant to standing order 53, the business for the week of 14 May is as follows:

On Monday 14 May, committee of the whole on Bill 68; on Tuesday 15 May, an opposition day in the name of the member for York South; on Wednesday 16 May, committee of the whole on Bill 68. On Thursday morning, 17 May, as it stands right now there is no private members' business, but I am sure that will be discussed on Monday. In the afternoon sitting, it will be third reading of Bill 68.

Mr Kormos: You are not going to make that promise to the insurance companies.

Mr Mackenzie: The only one they'll keep.

Hon Mr Conway: I hear people imputing motives, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Would the members show a little respect. It is now close to 6 of the clock and because of a motion previously passed by this House, this House now stands adjourned until next Monday at 1:30 of the clock.

The House adjourned at 1758.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaître, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray

Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Wednesday 9 May 1990

Members' statements

Bridge repairs	1131
Mr Allen	
Religious education	1131
Mr Jackson	
Literacy	1131
Mrs LeBourdais	
Drug abuse	1131
Mr Hampton	
Children's mental health services	1132
Mr McLean	
Violence against women	1132
Ms Oddie Munro	
Zigmas Vaisvila	1132
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Post-secondary education	1132
Mrs Cunningham	

Statements by the ministry

Drinking and driving	1133
Mr Scott	
Heritage conservation	1134
Ms Hart	
Dialysis	1135
Mrs Caplan	

Responses

Heritage conservation	1135
Miss Martel	
Drinking and driving	1136
Mr Kormos	
Dialysis	1136
Mr Reville	
Mr Eves	
Drinking and driving	1136
Mrs Cunningham	
Heritage conservation	1136
Mrs Marland	

Oral questions

Social assistance	1140
Mr B. Rae	
Mr R. F. Nixon	
Acid rain	1141
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Bradley	
Hospital beds	1142
Mr Eves	
Mrs Caplan	
Environmental protection	1142
Mrs Marland	
Mr Bradley	

Occupational health and safety	1143
Mr Mackenzie	
Mr Phillips	
Ministry mailing	1144
Mrs Wilson	
Mr Jackson	
Violence against women	1144
Mr Jackson	
Mrs Wilson	
Highway safety	1145
Mr Owen	
Mr Wrye	
Sault Ste Marie locks	1145
Mr Morin-Strom	
Mr Black	
Privatization	1146
Mr J. M. Johnson	
Mr Sorbara	
Part-time workers	1146
Mr Daigeler	
Mr Phillips	
Environmental assessment	1146
Mrs Grier	
Mr Bradley	
Capitol Theatre	1147
Mr Villeneuve	
Ms Hart	
Children's services	1147
Mr Kanter	
Mr Beer	
Child care	1148
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Mr Conway	

Report by committee

Standing committee on regulations and private bills .	1148
Mr Callahan	
Motion agreed to	1148

First reading

Ottawa Arts Centre Foundation Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr41	1148
Mr Grandmaitre	
Agreed to	1148

Government motion

Time allocation, motion 30	1148
Mr Elston	1148
Mr D. S. Cooke	1153
Mr Eves	1154
Mr Ward	1154
Agreed to	1155

Other business	Business of the House	1155
	Mr Ward	
Member for Niagara South	Adjournment	1155
Mr Haggerty		
Mr Laughren	Lists of members	
Mr Cureatz		
Mr R. F. Nixon	Members and their responsibilities	1156
Member for Sarnia	Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1159
Mr Eves		
Mr R. F. Nixon		
Mr B. Rae		
Mr Brandt		

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mercredi 9 mai 1990

Déclaration ministérielle

Conservation du patrimoine Ontarien	1134
Mme. Hart	

ADON
X
-123



32 90

32 90



**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Monday 14 May 1990

Le lundi 14 mai 1990

Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 14 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

OSHAWA GENERALS JUNIOR A HOCKEY CLUB

Mr Breagh: I am sure the members will want to join me in congratulating the Oshawa Generals, the Memorial Cup champions.

Hon Mr Sweeney: You were lucky.

Mr Breagh: The member for Kitchener-Wilmot says, "You were lucky." If so, we were lucky six times in a row. Six times in a row we beat the Kitchener team, in two double overtimes. We would have played all night and still had the same result.

It was a very fine Memorial Cup championship round. The Copps Coliseum was an excellent venue for the Memorial Cup this year. The competition was very good. I want to pay some credit to the Kitchener team. That is a good hockey club that did not quit. It went into double overtime again last night. About four minutes into the second overtime, Bill Armstrong did what a good defenceman is supposed to do: he put the puck in the net.

We are proud of this hockey club because it plays the game the way it is supposed to be played, with a great deal of skill. They work hard. They have great heart. We are proud of them when they win and proud of them when they lose, but it is a whole lot nicer when they win.

This afternoon we are going to go to the Civic Auditorium. If the members were smart, this afternoon, instead of doing what they are going to do all afternoon, they would adjourn this place and come to Oshawa to the Civic Auditorium, because there is going to be just about as good a time there this afternoon as there was at the Copps Coliseum last night about 11:45, when everybody stood up and cheered and had a great time for a great hockey team, the Oshawa Generals.

VISIONS 2020

Mrs Marland: Many members of the Legislature will have had an opportunity to speak with Ontario high school students who have collectively developed a vision for Ontario's future in the year 2020. Their work has been published by the non-profit organization Public Focus as a book called Visions 2020—Ontario's Youth, Ontario's Future.

The Visions 2020 program was developed in response to Our Common Future, the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. Six thousand students from schools across Ontario developed goals for the world they would like to live in 30 years from now. The students voted on the goals and each school submitted its three preferred goals to be included in the report.

We need more projects like Visions 2020 that bring our young people—our future—into the decision-making process. This project hopes to expand into a national program for the 1990-91 school year to help students develop a goal for a healthier Canada. I strongly encourage our federal government counterparts to give the project their full support.

Members of this House who have read Visions 2020 are impressed and touched by the passion of the students' visions, as well as their mature knowledge and understanding of our world's problems and potential. As legislators, we have an opportunity to work with these students to help them turn their visions into reality. It is a chance we cannot afford to pass up. Visions 2020 is one of the keys to our future.

KEN HUNTINGTON

Mr Ballinger: Recently the Elementary Teachers' Association—York Region selected a constituent of mine, Ken Huntington, as the top elementary schoolteacher in all of York region.

Mr Huntington, a resident of Beaverton in Brock township, was selected recipient of the coveted Timothy S. Roebuck Award. This special recognition was named in honour of a dedicated retired school superintendent, Timothy Roebuck, who devoted his entire career in education in pursuit of excellence.

This distinguished award is given annually to the teacher in York region "who has demonstrated an ability to inspire love of learning in students, the ability to work co-operatively with fellow professionals, the willingness to devote time and energy to children, the community, and to keep abreast of, and contribute to, educational theories and practices."

According to Linda Logan-Smith, president of the Elementary Teachers' Association—York Region, Ken's contributions to the teaching profession have been outstanding and he has set an example for all teachers to emulate. For 18 years, teaching all grades and most subjects, Ken has inspired students in Newmarket, Keswick and in his current position in guidance at Sutton Public School.

As the member of the Legislature for the riding of Durham-York, I would like to add my personal congratulations to Ken Huntington for being selected the top elementary schoolteacher in York region.

PAY EQUITY

Mr Farnan: This Liberal government has betrayed the women of Ontario. When Ontario's Pay Equity Act became law in 1987, the Ontario Legislature acknowledged the injustice of the fact that some women would not benefit from the legislation because of the lack of a male job title within their workplaces with which the jobs of these women could be compared.

To rectify this injustice, the Pay Equity Commission was given a mandate to thoroughly study the issue and make recommendations. In October 1989 the commission made its recommendations, which, had they been acted upon, would have extended the benefits of pay equity to all women covered by the act. Unfortunately, the Minister of Labour has rejected two of three proposals by the Pay Equity Commission to amend the Pay Equity Act.

The government amendments to the act do not go far enough. By his own admission, 105,000 women will be excluded because they do not have male comparators. These are in addition to the over 500,000 women already excluded by the act. Many Cambridge nurses and child care workers have registered with me their dissatisfaction with this Liberal government's second-class treatment of women.

The Pay Equity Commission's recommendations of a proxy comparison system for those women whose jobs have no male comparator within the workplace would resolve this matter. Nurses and child care workers and other women excluded by the act will demand a political price for the injustice to which they are being subjected.

1340

WILLIAM WITHROW

Mr Wiseman: I stand today to recognize an individual who has been one of the leading forces in the development of Ontario's cultural society. William Withrow has given 30 years of leadership to the Art Gallery of Ontario.

Mr Withrow joined the Art Gallery of Ontario, which was called the Art Gallery of Toronto in those days, in 1960 as the associate director and became the director in 1961, a position he holds today.

Under Mr Withrow's care and guidance the permanent collection has grown from 3,429 pieces to some 15,000 paintings, sculptures, prints and drawings. He has overseen three gallery expansions to accommodate the collection, which includes such masters as Rembrandt and the work of Canadian artists dating back to the 18th century.

In addition to lectures, tours, children's programs and concerts given regularly at the gallery, the AGO reaches into communities across Ontario and Canada. Last year 250,000 people in 32 Ontario communities enjoyed travel exhibitions organized by the gallery extension services.

Mr Withrow served during the Second World War, is a member of the Order of Canada and the founding president of the Canadian Art Museums Directors' Organization. I am sure all members join me in wishing him well.

CARABRAM

Mr Callahan: Once again, it is Carabram time approaching fast and furious. It will be held on 6, 7 and 8 July in the great city of Brampton. I would like to invite each and every one of the members of this House to sample some of the sights, tastes, sounds and costumes of the people in the 16 pavilions at a reception, once again being hosted this year by the Minister of Citizenship, following up on the honesty and fairness of our previous minister, the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, when he hosted such a reception.

I invite all members to attend in room 247 between 5:30 and 7 o'clock in the evening on 25 June 1990. I particularly invite each and every member, if they can visit the great city of Brampton for this festival, to join with myself, my counterpart the member for Brampton North, the Minister of Labour and his wife and the Minister of Citizenship and his wife on Saturday evening, 7 July, to tour some of these pavilions.

It is an opportunity to travel virtually around the world, to savour the sights, sounds and tastes without leaving Brampton. Members are certainly within fast running time back to Brampton or any other place. If they are outside the metropolitan area, they can get a plane from Pearson International Airport very easily.

I invite members to come. It is probably one of the most successful festivals in Ontario. It is one that should be emulated around Ontario, around Canada and perhaps around the world, to teach us understanding of one another's cultures.

STUDENT SAFETY

Mr R. F. Johnston: The pitch-in program is sponsored jointly by the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters and the Ministry of the Environment. This last week a great 1970s idea came face to face with 1990s realities when a friend of mine, a teacher at Samuel Hearne school in Scarborough, Dave Harris, was inadvertently pricked by a syringe as he was picking up garbage with some of his students behind a restaurant on Danforth Avenue.

I am now shocked to discover that no guidelines are given to teachers and school boards about how this program should be undertaken. There are no instructions about how to deal with pesticides, herbicides, solvents, condoms or syringes that kids may run into as they are out there and be put at jeopardy. Many of these schools do not even dispense gloves to the children, although the gloves that David was wearing certainly did not protect him when he was pricked by this syringe, and now has had to have HIV testing and a number of tetanus shots.

Municipal workers do not have to touch the garbage. They are well protected with outer clothing, shovels and brooms that are at arm's length, but we put our little children at risk with no age controls at all. In fact, people proudly talk about day-care-aged children being involved in this program.

I think it is time that boards of education, public health officers and parents turned to the Minister of the Environment and demanded that we get some standards, so that we get not only environmental consciousness-raising but some health and safety consciousness-raising as well in our schools with this program.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

Mr McLean: My statement is directed to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and it concerns National Tourism Week, which runs from today, 14 May, to 20 May.

This is a time when we all should be focusing our attention on the strengths and many accomplishments of Ontario's tourism and hospitality industry, which is capable of generating unparalleled economic and employment opportunities. It is an industry that can reduce this province's travel deficit and attract our rightful share of world travel and tourism revenues. It can do all this for the minister and yet he is doing nothing for it.

As a result of the minister's ineffective and inefficient representation of this vital segment of Ontario's economy, we have seen the tourism industry's revenue drop by \$3.25 billion and the loss of 30,000 full-time jobs in 1989. We have seen trips by the people of Ontario in their own province decline by 27.8%, while we have seen the numbers of Ontarians visiting the United States increase by 38.4%.

Ontario's tourism industry asked the minister and the Treasurer for help in the 24 April budget. The minister and Treasurer gave them nothing.

I think that while we are celebrating National Tourism Week, from 14 May to 20 May, we should also be helping what was once a vital, strong and important segment of Ontario's economy. It will continue to decline as long as the minister's government continues to ignore it. What a shameful state of affairs.

I would like to congratulate all those who work to promote tourism in Ontario.

MICHAEL SMITH

Mr Miclash: It gives me great pleasure to rise in the House today to pay tribute to Michael Smith, an outstanding athlete from the Kenora region.

In February 1990, Michael set a new Canadian record for the decathlon by accumulating 8,525 points on his way to winning the Commonwealth Games gold medal for this event in Auckland, New Zealand. He is being described as a great athlete around the world.

Michael Smith has brought credit and recognition, not only to Canada but also to his family and his community. At 22, he has been the epitome of hard work and excellence. He has become a role model for youth around the world and especially for those in northwestern Ontario.

We in Kenora are extremely proud of Michael, and in recognition for his contribution to his country and community, the town of Kenora has declared Wednesday 16 May 1990 as Michael Smith Day. Events that day will include a parade and dinner in honour of this outstanding individual. I am happy to say that I will be among those paying tribute to Michael on that day.

At this time, I would request the House to join me in acknowledging the outstanding achievements of this great athlete.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

POLICE WEEK

Hon Mr Offer: It gives me pleasure to announce that, beginning today, our province is recognizing Police Week, a national tradition of 20 years. I ask all members of this House to join me in expressing our appreciation to all police officials who serve us so well.

As Solicitor General, I recognize the tremendous challenges faced by today's police officers as they work to provide the citizens of this province with safe and secure communities. Our police officers are often the first line of contact between the public and the justice system in Ontario. This is a difficult position to be in, which challenges the best that they have to offer on a daily basis.

Every day, police officers put their lives on the line in the service of others. It is all too easy to take them for granted and only give them an appreciative thought when we need their assistance during an emergency situation. But the responsibilities carried by today's police officers have increased dramatically from their traditional role. Today, many new responsibilities have been added, such as crime prevention, public education and community relations.

Today's police officers deal with critical social issues such as drug awareness, drinking and driving, driver safety, multicultural relations, as well as sexual assault and assistance to victims of domestic violence. Today's police officers are part of, not apart from, our communities. Increasingly, they are taking a leadership role in partnership with community agencies to define needs and implement community service programs. In keeping with this concept, the chosen theme for this year's Police Week is "Partners for a Better Community."

We are putting many new demands upon our men and women in blue. However, Ontario's police are meeting these new responsibilities without hesitation and with the highest level of professionalism.

Police Week is a time to recognize their achievements. During Police Week many of the 118 municipal police forces and 182 Ontario Provincial Police detachments order special events in their communities to highlight their work and to pro-

vide opportunities for the community and the police to get to know each other in a positive and informal setting.

I would urge all members to give their wholehearted support to Police Week. They can do this by participating in one of the events organized by their local police force.

Police services in Ontario rank among the finest in the world. It is therefore with great pride that I ask all members of this House to take a moment during this special week to recognize the police who serve their community.

1350

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Hon Mr Kwinter: I am pleased to advise the House that I was in Windsor on Friday to participate in the Ford Motor Co of Canada Ltd announcement that it will build a \$59-million aluminum casting plant in that city. This unique plant will pioneer a new production process and when completed will employ a total workforce of 138 skilled and semiskilled workers.

The Ontario government is proud to take part in the development of this new plant with a \$9-million training and building assistance package. Of this total, \$1.2 million will be allocated to help Ford with infrastructure development costs. This is in keeping with the shift in emphasis from ministry funding for incentive programs to targeted infrastructure support that will benefit local community development. The government is committing the remainder of the money, \$7.8 million, to support a specialized skills training program for the workers at the plant.

As was identified by the Premier's Council, worker training will be one of the key human resource challenges of the 1990s. Developing our workforce will be our single most effective strategic weapon for improving our competitive ability in the global marketplace. Workers at the Ford plant will be equipped with problem-solving and communications skills in addition to job-specific skills. The development of this comprehensive training program will involve co-operation between my ministry, the ministries of Skills Development and Colleges and Universities, Ford, the community colleges and the Canadian Auto Workers union. Employee hiring and training will begin this year.

Ford estimates that it will commit \$9 million to research and development capital at the plant. In addition, Ford expects to see other expenditures in new production line designs, tooling modifications and robotics. The benefits of the new casting plant will not stop at the plant gate. The economic impact of this investment should spread throughout the community and eventually generate advanced industrial spinoffs for other companies in Windsor. This investment decision by Ford and our commitment to it are a clear vote of confidence for Windsor and the automotive sector.

RESPONSES

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr D. S. Cooke: I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and say that we certainly were happy on Friday to hear this good news. I would like to congratulate CAW Local 200 for the very positive role it played in negotiating amendments to the collective agreement that were very substantially responsible for Ford coming to Windsor. I think that might have been missed by the minister—the very important role that the union played.

I would, however, like to say to the minister that while we appreciate the involvement of the provincial government, this is only 138 jobs. With a potential spinoff of even one and a half jobs more, we are still talking about a very small number of jobs in a community that just in the last few weeks through plant closures has lost well over 500 jobs. Our unemployment rate has fluctuated considerably over the last few months—it has been as high as 13%—and we must understand very clearly the very substantial problems in the auto parts sector in Canada.

As the minister knows, before the free trade agreement there was a requirement for 60% Canadian content. Under the free trade agreement there is a requirement for 50% North American content. That will result—and we have already seen it—in a substantial shift to Mexico of the low-technology auto parts sector that currently exists in Ontario. Several consultants have said that as much as 50% of the auto parts sector in Ontario can be expected to shut down and move to Mexico by the turn of the century.

The challenges in the auto parts sector are very substantial in communities like Windsor, which are one-industry towns extremely dependent on the auto parts sector and the auto assembly sector. They are going to require more than 138 jobs and a much better strategy by this government.

We still remember that, when we had the last provincial election, the Premier came to Windsor and made his response to the free trade agreement where he said there would be no agreement if the auto pact was going to be threatened. Well, the auto pact was not just threatened by the free trade agreement; the auto pact was gutted by the free trade agreement. Yet Ontario did absolutely nothing of any substance to stop the free trade agreement even though the Liberals went to the people in 1987 and said they needed a mandate to stop free trade. They got that mandate with 95 seats out of 130 and then they just laid down and allowed the free trade agreement to come into force.

Southern Ontario, and Windsor in particular, is going to be and has already been hurt substantially by this agreement. It is not going to do for the member to just come down to Windsor and announce 138 jobs, a \$9-million subsidy to a very profitable corporation—and the jobs will not even take place for three years.

The other thing is, if this government is serious about helping out the community of Windsor, then it will do something much more substantial in its own backyard, and that is with the public sector jobs. We have about 800 of them in Windsor. London, up Highway 401, has nearly 4,000. London has one of the lowest unemployment rates in all of Canada; Windsor has one of the highest unemployment rates. If the government really wants to do something to help us diversify our economy, it should shift some of those public sector jobs to Windsor and help stimulate our economy in Windsor.

POLICE WEEK

Mr Kormos: We of course join with the Solicitor General in celebrating Police Week for 1990 and in paying tribute to police officers, men and women across Ontario, both in municipal police forces and in our Ontario Provincial Police Force, for the outstanding job they do, a job that they do not because of, but oftentimes in spite of, what this government has done to policing here in the province of Ontario.

Policing has never been more complex. It has never been more difficult. Indeed, it is fair to say that it has never been more dangerous. At the same time, the community has never been more demanding of its police forces.

In view of that and in the face of that, this government is consistent in an agenda which day after day, month after month, year after year is pulling the rug out from underneath police forces in communities across Ontario. Police forces are radically underfunded. Police forces have burdens placed on them now as a result of Bill 187 and this government's insistence that municipal police forces have forced upon them the responsibility for policing in the courts without there being any appropriate funding of those municipalities for the extra responsibilities. Police officers are doing their very best in communities across Ontario to engage in a war against drugs and drug trafficking, but videotapes do not permit the police to shut down drug traffickers.

The fact is that if this government is going to be serious about the role of progressive policing in Ontario, it had better be prepared to start committing some real funds to that role.

Mr Runciman: The members of the Progressive Conservative caucus would like to join with the government and the NDP members in expressing our appreciation to policemen and policewomen across this province, who do indeed serve us all so well. I want to say, though, that we have some very real concerns about what is happening in respect to policing and, generally, law and order in Ontario.

My new leader, our party's new leader since Saturday, the member for Nipissing, mentioned his concerns about the fact that he now has to streetproof his five-year-old son. There are growing concerns in this province, and I think they are legitimate.

I had a police sergeant from Metropolitan Toronto phone my office a number of months ago saying that police morale has never been so low in the 30 years he has served in policing in the province. In 30 years he has never seen morale so low.

We are talking about recent surveys showing that 50% of women are afraid, are really afraid, to go out into the streets in the evenings. We have other statistics indicating increases in violent crime on the TTC in Metropolitan Toronto. We have the wife of the mayor of Toronto, Brenda Eggleton, saying she is afraid to walk in High Park at any time in the day, indicating she is afraid with respect to the decrease in law and order and the effectiveness of policing in the city of Toronto.

We have seen violent crime in Metropolitan Toronto increase by 47.9%—that is a statistic; that is a fact—in the four and a half years the Liberals have been in office. On an Ontario-wide basis, we have seen violent crime increase by close to 37% in the time the Liberal Party has held office in this province. From 1985 to 1989, again during the Liberal reign in Ontario, we have seen drug offences in this province increase by 80%.

What do we see happening in respect to the Liberal government's reaction? We see the Attorney General chastising police officers who criticized a judge for letting drug pushers out in the street. That is what we see the Liberal government doing. What kind of impact does that have on police morale across this province? The reality is that 95% of illicit drugs coming into this country end up on the streets. We want to talk about where this government's priorities lie.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

1400

Mr Runciman: Its priorities lie in placing an army of police on Highway 401—thousands of police—with their radar detectors and in the doubling and tripling of speeding fines. We

are concerned about highway safety. We are seeing women attacked on the 401. We are seeing significant crime increases right across this province. Where do the Liberal government's priorities lie in respect to law and order in this province? They are certainly wrong.

We see the police in this province outgunned and outmanned at every turn. When they talk about doing away with the .38 revolver, increasing their ability to deal on an equivalent basis with the criminal faction in this province, they are turned down flat by the Solicitor General. There is no empathy, no support, for the problems faced by the cop on the beat in this province.

It is about time this Liberal government faced up to its responsibilities, increased the funding and gave the manpower and the equipment necessary to do the job of effectively fighting crime in Ontario.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Are you enjoying wasting the time?

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. It is your time.

ORAL QUESTIONS

NEONATAL CARE

Mr Reville: My question this afternoon is to the Minister of Health. Thursday afternoon a 25-year-old woman named Marlies Bannister entered the emergency ward of the Ajax and Pickering General Hospital. She was 25 weeks into her pregnancy. The attending doctor, Dr McIntyre, realized that he would need a special care unit if the delivery was to be successful. He called the neonatal hotline for better than two hours. Three and a half hours later the young woman was flown to Kingston and regrettably the doctor there was unable to save the child. I wonder if the Minister of Health could explain how this could have happened.

Hon Mrs Caplan: Certainly for any family which has experienced a tragedy such as this it is a very sad time. I am pleased to give the member opposite what details I can about how the registry works. I would start off by telling him that the mortality rate for infants at 25-week gestation is extremely high; these are considered very high risk.

The information we have is that the doctor contacted the registry system at 5:40. It was determined within 15 minutes or so that a bed was available in London. High winds prevented the transfer to London. A bed was found at Kingston General Hospital and the patient was transferred there and arrived over an hour before the delivery actually took place.

In these kinds of situations it is extremely important for everyone to realize that highly specialized service is what is sought, as not all hospitals are able to provide this service. The ministry's co-ordinator has investigated and determined that in fact the system did work.

Mr Reville: The results clearly were not desirable. This is not a new situation in the province. It is clearly the most horrible tragedy that could have occurred for this young woman. Members of the opposition raised this problem on 5 January 1988, 17 November 1988 and 1 March 1989. We had a series of ministerial communiqués which were to respond to the instances that we raised, and still the system seems not to have worked very well. The minister will recall telling me in January 1988 that two level 3 perinatal units were located in

Metropolitan Toronto and one in Hamilton, as well as the one in London that might have been able to take the mother had the winds not been so bad.

You have to wonder how it could have been that there was no capacity in a hospital closer than Kingston. How could that be?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I think what is important to focus on is the fact that we have a network in place and also that we are world leaders in perinatal service. Our success rate in keeping more infants alive has been increasing substantially since regionalization of perinatal services and the introduction of the perinatal bed registry. In 1979 there were 12.1 deaths per 1,000 births, and this rate had dropped to 8.7 per 1,000 by 1985.

The system is such that all of the centres are connected and when a physician calls the registry he is directed to the nearest available highly specialized service. In this case, the patient was transported, she arrived prior to delivery and from everything that we can determine she received the best of care.

Mr Reville: The minister has tried to do this to the opposition before and flim-flam us on the perinatal-neonatal difference. In fact, what the doctor was looking for in this case was a neonatal unit. The minister thinks it was a perinatal unit. Clearly one of us is not correct, and I leave it to the people of Ontario to decide on the record who is more likely to be correct in this case.

The family knows that the minister's system did not work for it. Clearly, in spite of the announcements over the past couple of years that this is one of the focus areas or one of the target areas for the government, there is still a problem. It seems to me that the problem has to be in the supply of critical care nurses. The minister has failed to deal with that problem at all in a meaningful way, in spite of all the co-ordinators she may appoint.

When will the minister ensure that the perinatal and neonatal units that we do have are staffed by nurses who can in fact provide the level of care that is needed?

Hon Mrs Caplan: The whole purpose of the registry is to make sure that a high-risk mother gets access to the very highly specialized services that she needs prior to giving birth. In this particular case, which unfortunately did not have a successful ending, the mother did get access to the perinatal service at Kingston General Hospital. The system found not one bed, but two. I would say to the member opposite that in fact the system did work.

POLICE COMMISSION NOMINATION

Mr Kormos: I have a question to the Deputy Premier. We find out this weekend, as a result of the Globe and Mail obtaining a copy of a letter from the Attorney General to the Solicitor General of the day back in 1986, that indeed the Attorney General endorsed Elvio DelZotto for a position on the Ontario Police Commission. The Premier told us last summer in this House, in June 1989, that neither the Premier nor the Attorney General supported the nomination of Elvio DelZotto. In view of the fact that there is a letter dated 9 May 1986 from that Attorney General to the Solicitor General of the day endorsing Elvio DelZotto, how is it that the Premier could have said that last June?

Hon R. F. Nixon: I am sure that the Premier, when he answered the question, said what was the truth, as he always does.

1410

Mr Kormos: The statement of the Premier to the House was that the only record is a letter from Ms Starr to the Attorney General. We know now that the Attorney General similarly wrote to the Solicitor General. Now, we are not talking about an unknown. Elvio DelZotto was well known in the Liberal Party, he is well known in the province of Ontario, both in the development industry and otherwise; why Judge Waisberg said he was well known back in Judge Waisberg's inquiry into crime and violence in the construction industry back in 1974. So we are not dealing with just another nameless face in the crowd; we are dealing with a very prominent, obviously powerful person.

I will ask the Deputy Premier once again: In view of the fact that the letter from the Attorney General of Ontario to the Solicitor General is in the possession of the Globe and Mail, how could the Premier tell us in June of 1989 that the Attorney General did not endorse when in fact there was a letter confirming that?

Hon R. F. Nixon: I think it might be helpful if I just reminded the honourable member, who is getting quite exercised about this matter, that Mr DelZotto, whatever his capabilities, was not appointed to the police commission.

Mr Kormos: Through no effort on the part of either the Attorney General or the Premier, because indeed it was several months later, in August 1986, when a Mr Dubro telephoned the Premier's office, some three months after the letter from the Attorney General to the Solicitor General recommending DelZotto, and Mr Dubro was told by the Premier's office that, yes, the DelZotto nomination was still very much alive and well and was being considered for appointment to the Ontario Police Commission.

I am not going to say that the Premier lied back in June 1986 because that would be grossly improper and that is the only reason why I am not going to say that, but I put this to the Deputy Premier: How could the Premier be so grossly inaccurate and not bother to correct himself when indeed the facts prove him to have been so grossly inaccurate about the Attorney General's endorsement of Elvio DelZotto?

Hon R. F. Nixon: There is nothing to indicate that the Premier answered to the House anything other than what he knew and believed to be correct and I am sure that this is a clear consideration that the honourable member, whom I would not want to call irresponsible, might take into consideration.

CARDIOVASCULAR CARE

Mrs Cunningham: I have a question for the Minister of Health. David Munro, the 32-year-old son of a physician in London, died recently, just a day ago, in hospital here in Toronto. He was on a waiting list for some surgery for over a year for an infected heart valve. He was only 32 years old. We know we have challenges in our system. We talk about priorities and the quality of life and we talk about priorities and programs that should be available to everyone in Ontario. He was promised that the surgery would not be too late and, tragically, this was not the case. His father said that the health care system cannot treat people with promises. The minister must share our concern. What went wrong and what is she going to do about it?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I spoke to the surgeon in this particular case just this afternoon. He informed me that in fact a surgical date was offered in January to Mr Munro and he chose to wait until spring to have his surgery.

Mr Eves: The minister likes to quote in this House from time to time Dr Keon in Ottawa, as she has done on previous occasions. He is quoted in the media over the weekend as saying, "We are meeting with provincial health officials to discuss the implementation of a province-wide central registry for cardiovascular surgery patients, which will do away with the situation which happened in the case of David Munro, who was on the list for over a year."

Interjection.

Mr Eves: He was not on the list for over a year? Well, that is not what his father says; that is not what Dr Keon says either. How can it be that we are now getting around to addressing this in May 1990 when the minister stood up in this House on 9 June 1988, almost two full years ago, and told us she had solved this entire problem; there was no problem; she had solved it?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I will repeat again what I responded to the member for London North. In fact, a surgery date was made available to Mr Munro in January. He was an elective patient and he chose—the surgeon told me this himself this morning—he chose to wait until spring to have his surgery.

I am pleased that the member opposite has given me an opportunity to focus on the very important cardiovascular network that we are developing in this province. We have been working with cardiac surgeons and specialists from across the province to link together, both on a regional basis and on a province-wide basis, the facilities, having common definitions so that we could offer both patients and physicians the information they need so patients could have more choices available to them.

Mr Eves: I have a supplementary to the minister about this problem throughout the province of Ontario with respect to cardiovascular surgery. Since she made her announcement of 9 June 1988, the following people have died on the waiting list: Brendan McLean, October 1988; Richard Rutter, October 1988; William Watts, January 1989; Charles Coleman, December 1988; Maria Gaccioli, January 1989, and now David Munro, May 1990. I am sure there are others that we do not know about who have chosen not to publicize their specific instances.

The fact of the matter is that the minister is not allocating the resources for beds and for nursing staff. We have stood up repeatedly in this House and asked her, for example, in the past few weeks about critical care nurses at the Hospital for Sick Children. She never gives a specific answer to these questions. She talks in terms of generalities; she supposedly solved this problem over two years ago. What is wrong with the system? Why are people still dying on the waiting list, a problem that she supposedly solved two years ago? Why is this happening?

The Speaker: Thank you. You asked the question twice.

Hon Mrs Caplan: I would very much like to share with the member some comments of Dr Keon's that perhaps would be helpful to him. He said in March of this year that he has been "very impressed with the spirit of co-operation among leading surgeons from across Ontario, nurses and administrators, and it is the first time the ministry has provided a milieu for all of us to come together to express our views to the ministry." He went on to say, "It should be a pretty ideal system and the capacity

for heart surgery in Ontario will be about ideal in 1990. The system will be as good as anywhere."

Interjections.

The Speaker: Is it okay if I recognize the member for Mississauga South for a new question?

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Mrs Marland: My question is for the Minister of the Environment. The minister knows Canadians throw out more garbage than any other people in the world. In Metropolitan Toronto the amount of garbage produced has increased dramatically from the mid-1980s to the present. Now we face a severe crisis.

In a scramble for landfill sites, the government is exempting interim sites in the greater Toronto area from the Environmental Assessment Act. This is a shortsighted non-solution. What we really need is a streamlined assessment process, but after more than two years' work by EAPIP, the environmental assessment program involvement project, we have seen only the phase 1 report. We will not see the phase 2 results from EAPIP until this summer, which is more than a year behind schedule.

When will this government have a plan ready for revamping the environmental assessment process?

Hon Mr Bradley: I know the member would want to ensure that any changes that would be made to the Environmental Assessment Act would do two things: first of all, would protect all of the environmental concerns that people would have, as the present acts do, and at the same time allow for it to be as efficient as possible.

We have brought together virtually all of the people who would have a viewpoint in this from various groups—the environmental groups, those in the legal profession, those who are involved with municipalities and those who are in the government process itself—to attempt to find the best way to make the process work as it should. I am confident, as I am sure the people who are involved in the process are confident, that the product that will be produced will, in fact, be one which will be conducive to protecting the environment in this province and doing so in an efficient manner.

1420

Mrs Marland: The environmental assessment is not the only area where this government has failed miserably. To solve our garbage crisis, we must create less garbage. That means reducing waste at source, reusing containers and recycling, but only on recycling has the government made any progress. The minister knows that recycling alone will not achieve his waste diversion targets. He must acknowledge that 14% is a long way from 25% or 50%.

Can the minister tell this House what initiatives he has taken to reduce garbage at source and to promote reuse of containers and consumer goods?

Hon Mr Bradley: The member may be aware that we have programs in place which would deal not only with household garbage to which she has made reference but a number of programs which are very beneficial to those who are involved in the business and industrial sector in terms of the reduction of the waste which would be created.

We have the industrial 3Rs program as well, which we think is very good in that people who come forward with innovative ideas in fact have those ideas put into effect not only within their own businesses but within businesses across Ontario. In-

deed, there are people in other jurisdictions who are benefiting from this, and we see this as positive. We do not see it as stealing ideas from us. We see it as being positive for the country as a whole.

The member would know, for instance, that devoted to the 3Rs program is some close to \$55 million for this particular year, which I think is an exceedingly generous amount of money being provided in addition to the money that is coming in from the private sector in the same direction. We were also part of the national protocol which was developed. People who were from the Ministry of the Environment of Ontario, and indeed others from the province of Ontario, made significant input and at the last meeting of environment officials that was held in Vancouver, in fact a protocol was signed and a national program is being implemented, including all of the provinces and the federal government.

Mrs Marland: It is really hard to understand this minister's lack of leadership and ideas. After all, there are lots of groups that are eager to help him. He ignored the report of the Canadian Environmental Law Research Foundation on the environmental assessment process. He is also ignoring the good advice on waste reduction that is available. Last Saturday, for example, the Toronto Star reported that a group called It's Not Garbage recommended making source separation mandatory, setting up processing stations, creating a provincial waste reduction office and announcing a comprehensive waste management plan by the end of the summer. Instead of the hit-and-miss announcements he usually makes, will this minister produce a plan emphasizing reduction and reuse by this fall?

Hon Mr Bradley: The member, if she were to follow carefully, would know that is exactly what is happening right across Ontario, that innovative ideas are forthcoming, not only from the government sector but from the private sector, which are in fact having that effect. She would also know that, for instance, there are some two million households in Ontario which are now involved in the blue box program which is being emulated by so many other jurisdictions around North America and, indeed, around the world. Over 300 municipalities, of their own volition, are taking part in this program.

If you go to any other objective observer—if you go to the other provinces and talk to them, go to a national meeting of environment officials—they will tell you, of course, that Ontario, and indeed the people of Ontario, as seen through the United Nations Environment Program award, are the leaders in this field and will continue to be the leaders in this field.

We will take advantage of all of the advice which is provided, including the groups that the member has mentioned to us. One of the groups is working in the environmental assessment program involvement project at the present time to assist in improving upon the environmental assessment process, which has been of great benefit to Ontario, a process which was not implemented when Darlington was built.

ANTI-DRUG STRATEGIES

Mr Morin-Strom: I have a question for the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy. The minister issued a major report with respect to this government's anti-drug strategy late last year. In it, detailed initiatives encompassed a number of ministries, including the ministries of Health, Labour, Education and the Solicitor General. Notably absent was the Ministry of Community and Social Services,

which has traditionally been responsible for anti-drug strategies and strategies generally dealing with youth under the age of 16.

To this point, there are no programs in the province of Ontario dealing with children and youth under the age of 16. I would like to ask the minister, when is he going to respond to recommendations such as have been made to that ministry by Algoma Child and Youth Services in Sault Ste Marie, for example, which have been asking that services be made available to those children so that they do not have to go to such far-flung communities as Minneapolis, St Louis—

The Speaker: Thank you. You do not have to explain the reason for the question.

Hon Mr Black: I am very pleased to respond to that question. Let me first of all correct a couple of statements that were made by the member.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services does in fact have some very sound programs that assist young people who have all kinds of problems, including those related to illegal drug use. You will also be interested in knowing, Mr Speaker, as I am sure all members were, that just recently, in the last two months, we announced an additional initiative to try to provide support for young people who needed that, and we announced some \$4 million worth of additional funding to provide services for youth in need of those services.

Mr Morin-Strom: The minister should know then, when it comes to many communities, they are not being served at all by this government. The local Breakaway program has processed some 106 young people for substance abuse services over the last two years. Out-of-town services were needed for 46 of them. Of those, 33 had to go to the United States for services, to communities far-flung from Sault Ste Marie.

When are we going to see established in this province residential treatment programs, preferably right in people's home towns? If they are not available in every home town of this province, where are the residential treatment programs going to be for these young people who need these kinds of services?

Hon Mr Black: First of all, let me point out to the member that at the present time the province of Ontario is spending over \$60 million in providing treatment facilities for people with addiction problems. That includes funding from the Ministry of Health, from the Ministry of Community and Social Services and from the Ministry of Correctional Services.

Second, let me point out to him that this total funds some 255 programs, which range from detoxification centres to after-care services—a full range of treatment services. Everyone who is an expert in this field will share with the member, I am sure, the view that we do need the full range of services. I would not suggest that this means we have met all of the needs, because all of us in this House know that that is not the case. However, we are moving forward and we are making progress. We have increased our funding significantly. I had the opportunity just last week to visit New York City and to spend some time in two different treatment programs there.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Black: I was not there as a client, I might tell the member. The average waiting period for admission to those programs is five weeks. I am also informed by people who operate treatment programs here in Ontario that we now have residents of the United States who are applying for admission to treatment programs here in Ontario. So not all of the waiting

lists are in Ontario; they are in many jurisdictions. There is a need to try to provide more services. We are working on that.

WOMEN'S APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

Mrs Cunningham: The Minister of Education is aware of Competing in the New Global Economy. He is also probably aware of the immediate need to address the various shortcomings in the apprenticeship system in Ontario. Would the minister please update us on the program called Women's Access to Apprenticeship Demonstration Projects?

Hon Mr Conway: May I just take this, my first opportunity, to say that I was very impressed by my friend the member for London North as she spoke to the nation on Saturday afternoon. I want to say, just as a friend and colleague, how impressed I was by her verve and her success with the delegates. I must report to the House that I think she swept the delegates in Renfrew North, where she left a very, very positive impression.

1430

Interjections.

Hon Mr Conway: Listen, I feel it is only proper that I share with my friend the news from the eastern front, where her friend from Manotick also reported very considerable success and awaits, I know, all the benefits that will accrue from that.

The honourable member will know that the government has announced over the last number of months initiatives to increase the participation of women, not just in apprenticeship but in a variety of other areas, particularly in trades and technology. We have been very pleased with the results that we have achieved to date, involving, as we have, the women's directorate, the labour movement and others, to be sure.

As my friend would understand, we are not going to change attitudes and past practices overnight, but as a government we are determined to build on these initiatives and to add to those others that will provide for the Ontario community and economy a fuller participation for women in all areas of skills in trades and technology.

Mrs Cunningham: I would like to take the opportunity just for a second to thank the minister but to tell him that during the next election he is going to have to be much more specific in his responses to our questions.

Current numbers indicate that in each of the last four years the number of women entering non-traditional occupations through his ministry's apprenticeship program has declined in relative percentage terms. The minister is going to have to take this challenge seriously. It is not new; it has been around for the last five years. We are tired of the promises. When is the minister going to advise this House of some real progress in the women's apprenticeship programs?

Hon Mr Conway: I want to say to my friend opposite that we recognize that there is a real challenge to be met. That is why, for example, working with the women's directorate, we have sponsored some 30 pilot projects to increase the participation of women in these areas. The labour movement has increasingly shown an interest in and a support for increasing the participation of women as well.

My honourable friend could perhaps be of material assistance in one area where she might be more effective than I am. She might, at an early opportunity, speak to Mrs McDougall, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, and try to do something about federal restrictions on funding the appren-

ticeship programs, restrictions which over the last two or three years have placed real burdens on provinces such as Ontario in meeting the emerging need.

WINDSOR AREA AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr M. C. Ray: I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. It concerns Ontario government incentives to potential manufacturing investors in Ontario, with particular reference to the city of Windsor and the auto parts tool and die and mould industries.

The minister will know that the Windsor area is under heavy competition from the United States, cities in the states of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, Kentucky and Georgia. They offer the kinds of programs which we do not have here and which the minister has spoken against, such programs as property tax deferrals, property tax forgiveness or municipal bonds, tax-free bonds, that kind of thing.

In view of the heavy economic pressure that the auto parts industry is under these days and the structural changes that are occurring in the industry, could the minister advise on what kinds of programs are under consideration, if any, and when we can expect to see some kinds of programs come forward from his ministry to address these issues?

Hon Mr Kwinter: As I have said on several other occasions, we do not intend to get involved in a bidding war where we will be offering tax deferrals, tax holidays, interest-free land or even cost-free land, but we do feel that we have a competitive environment. The member will know that on Friday we announced the support that we provided to the Ford Motor Co., which provides incentives for training and incentives for infrastructure support.

We also have other programs. The Treasurer announced in his budget the increase of the capital cost allowance for industrial equipment. We have a superallowance for research and development. We have programs through the various initiatives of the Premier's Council. We also have inherent benefits built into our tax structure.

Our payroll taxes are lower than the United States. Our social security taxes are lower. Our hydro is lower. We have all of those things that act as incentives, and we feel we are competitive and will continue to be competitive.

Mr M. C. Ray: The Windsor area of course appreciates the \$9-million grant to Ford Motor last week, but it is exactly that kind of program that is not known to many small and medium-sized investors.

When will the ministry bring forward a known set of policies with defined criteria such as are available in the adjoining states and are offered to potential manufacturers—known programs that companies can apply for without having to negotiate on an individualized basis for undefined benefits that may be obtainable through the minister or his ministry?

Hon Mr Kwinter: We have a network throughout Ontario of offices of the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology. These people are out there providing this service to small and medium-sized industries that require it. We have offices of the Ontario Development Corp, the Northern Ontario Development Corp and the Eastern Ontario Development Corp that do exactly the same thing. We have self-help centres throughout the province. We have a parliamentary committee on small business that publishes a report on small business and the incentives and programs that are available for it.

I think the material is out there. I think those companies that are needy of it know of it and come in to see us, and given the

structure, I really do not think we can offer a menu so people can say, "I will take this, this and this." It really has to be negotiated on an individual basis.

The Speaker: I recognize the member for Lake Nipigon. But I believe the Minister of Education etc has a response to a question previously asked by the member for Scarborough West.

CHILD CARE

Hon Mr Conway: That is correct. I am very pleased to take a moment to respond to a question that my friend the member for Scarborough West raised at the end of question period on Wednesday, a concern about the fact that Seneca College is intending at the end of this school year, June 1990, to close its lab school at Glen Park.

It is true, I can tell the House, that the college has made that determination for a number of reasons. Staffing difficulties is one of the factors. The other factor is that the North York Board of Education has indicated that some of the space that has been available to the college for the operation of that lab school will not be available even if a lease is renegotiated.

I can tell my honourable friend that there is, as he knows, another child care centre operating in the immediate area. My colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services has indicated to me that there is an examination under way as to whether or not a number of additional spaces might be added to that particular facility.

I can also tell my honourable friend that we recognize that Seneca will continue to operate a lab school, I believe at its King campus, so the needs of the early childhood education students in the college will continue to be met.

I am hopeful that the child care needs of that part of Metropolitan Toronto can continue to be analysed and met, perhaps by the Ministry of Community and Social Services licensing additional spaces to the other site on that facility.

Mr R. F. Johnston: I recognize the fact that the other campus has spaces still available. Frankly, I do not think there are adequate spaces for the 200 ECE students they have registered. They do have time. As the minister knows, the board does not need the space for at least two years.

I wonder if the minister can give me some idea from his discussions with the Minister of Community and Social Services about how many spaces are likely to be made available and whether or not some interim arrangement can be made to expand the other day care and to provide that as a secondary space for the ECE on-the-job training.

1440

Hon Mr Conway: I should simply say two things: My colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services is well aware of the situation and is actively working to analyse the options, but the college has made very clear to me that it is its expectation and belief that it is going to be able to meet its ECE needs with the lab school that is, I believe, at the King campus.

It is the view of the management of Seneca College that it is going to be able to meet its ECE needs, and my friend the Minister of Social Services will, as the member knows, be ever sensitive to ensuring that the child care needs of the community in that part of Metropolitan Toronto are addressed.

CANCER TREATMENT

Mr Pouliot: I have a question to the Minister of Health. We learned a couple of weeks ago that her ministry was indeed paying the full cost of air fare and hotel transportation for cancer patients sent from Toronto for treatment in Thunder Bay. We also learned that those patients were entitled to be accompanied by an escort whose expenses for air fare and hotel were fully paid.

I have the case of a 38-year-old blind man residing in Red Lake in northwestern Ontario, who was referred to Winnipeg to see an ophthalmologist. When he requested an escort to help him make this difficult trip, he applied to the Ministry of Health for assistance and guess what? He was refused. That blind man was refused.

How does the minister explain the double standard and the travesty between southern Ontario and again the poor people of the north?

Hon Mrs Caplan: The member opposite is incorrect. All cancer patients are treated the same way whether they live in northern Ontario, southern Ontario, eastern Ontario or western Ontario. Anyone in need of financial assistance, in financial need, is assisted by the Canadian Cancer Society. For a very short period of time there was some assistance for those who were referred through the Princess Margaret patient referral office.

Mr Pouliot: It has got nothing to do with a blind person, who is entitled—

Hon Mrs Caplan: I will say to the member opposite that residents of northern Ontario—

The Speaker: Order. Would the member take his seat? Thank you. We do have a standing order, 20b, that says that no member shall interrupt another member. So now I will try to keep the other members quiet while you place your supplementary.

Oh, the member for Rainy River.

Mr Hampton: I too have an interest in this, since I am aware of the plight of the gentleman from Red Lake. I want to ask the Minister of Health basically this. She has set up artificial distinctions within the Ministry of Health. She treats cancer patients a little better than other patients. She treats cancer patients from southern Ontario royally indeed.

The fact of the matter is that she has someone who is in need of health care from the community of Red Lake. He is blind. He is referred to a city he has not been to before. He asks under the northern health travel grant program for payment for an escort. Her ministry says no. Yet when patients are referred from southern Ontario to Thunder Bay for cancer treatment, her ministry pays the whole lock, stock and barrel: air fare, hotel accommodation, taxis, meals, the whole list. How does she justify these artificial, stupid distinctions?

Hon Mrs Caplan: The northern travel grant program, which is an extremely important program for residents of northern Ontario, is very distinct and very different from assistance that is available for all cancer patients in the province, regardless of where they are from.

I would say to the member that in fact we are, as he knows, presently reviewing the northern travel grant program. We have been consulting across the north and I want him to know that we are always trying to review that program to make sure it is a fair and as equitable as it can be. But he cannot compare two very different programs within the Ministry of Health.

Mr Hampton: That is right, artificial distinctions. Some people get treated royally.

Mr Pouliot: It's the rich against the poor, that's what it is.

The Speaker: Are you finished?

Interjections.

The Speaker: What a waste of time. Order.

BEEKEEPING INDUSTRY

Mr Villeneuve: I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. The minister will recall that several times we have discussed the problems now being created by the tracheal mite to our beekeepers and honey producers. We have known for some time that our fruit and crop producers could be in considerable difficulty if this infestation spreads, and it has. With Niagara now under quarantine, what sort of additional assistance can the beekeepers expect right now from the minister and his ministry?

Hon Mr Ramsay: I am glad to have the opportunity to inform the member, who I know shares the same interest that I do in the bee situation in Ontario in regard especially to pollination of our tender fruit area, that not only is the quarantine in Niagara but also it affects my own riding in Timiskaming, as there is a quarantine around New Liskeard and in eastern Ontario.

Besides those quarantines, we are also looking at destroying hives that are infected and we are working with the Ontario Beekeepers' Association on this. We are also looking at compensation to do this. The other thing too is that we have stepped up our research component at the University of Guelph in order to find a mite-resistant bee.

Mr Villeneuve: This is a disaster that everyone, including the minister and the ministry, could have predicted. It has been ongoing and expanding for the last 18 months. Over a year ago the beekeepers' association requested a \$6.2-million, four-year assistance program. It was turned down by the minister's predecessor.

Our beekeepers do not normally ask for assistance, but the need is obvious and urgent now. This sector of agriculture is in a very serious economic condition. What real dollar support can the minister announce today to provide for them right now?

Hon Mr Ramsay: I share the admiration that the honourable member has for the industry and I agree that the beekeepers are a very important and vital part of the agrifood industry in Ontario, much more than even just the product they produce because they obviously enhance the production of other products in the province.

I did announce some money for the association. We are also looking at some ways that the association can raise money on its own to keep the group going, and I continue to work on each of the different topics that we are mutually interested in to try to find some assistance for it in the future.

I welcome that association with the association and the honourable member's support, and we will continue to support beekeeping in this province.

ELEVATORS

Miss Roberts: My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and concerns the elevating devices in the province of Ontario. Last week a press conference was held here which called into question the ability of this government to effectively regulate the elevating devices in this

province. In that press conference it was alleged that the government was not doing enough to ensure that the elevators in Ontario were safe. It was reported that those present suggested that, given the choice, people should use the stairs.

What is this government doing to ensure the safety of elevating devices in Ontario, or should we—I and all others—take the stairs?

Hon Mr Sorbara: There are all sorts of good reasons for the member for Elgin and all of us to use the stairs, but it has nothing to do with the fact that elevators may or may not be safe.

The real weakness of the report put out last week was that it seemed to suggest, in the way in which it was drafted, that the inspection process was the single feature of the ministry which was used in order to guarantee and regulate the safety of elevators, and of course that is not true.

Inspections are important, but the major element in the regulation of safety of the system is the legal requirement of every owner of an elevator to be the beneficiary of a maintenance contract. That is, the elevator must be subject to a maintenance contract for ongoing maintenance of that elevator, and failure to do that results in a very significant fine. Those fines were recently increased from \$10,000 to \$100,000.

Those contractors are the first line of defence, and any failure to do that, of course, as I said, would be identified by an inspector. We are doing a number of other things, including a radically new approach to managing our information within the ministry. Perhaps I will talk more about those if the member has a supplementary.

1450

Miss Roberts: My supplementary has two parts. First, I believe there are somewhere in the area of 30,000 elevating devices in the province. At last count, however, we only had 30 inspectors. How can 30 inspectors maintain the 30,000 devices on a satisfactory basis or even check them on a satisfactory basis? Second, assuming this number of inspectors is simply not sufficient, is the minister doing anything to increase the number of inspectors, and what is he doing to ensure that their time is spent as effectively as possible to make sure that not just extra staff and extra money are being thrown at this particular problem?

Hon Mr Sorbara: There are a lot of questions in there. Perhaps I can help my friend the member for Elgin by telling her that, first of all, we have, as she says, about 30 inspectors. We are actually in a worldwide search for people who can be retained as elevator inspectors. There is a shortage right throughout North America, so we have recently asked the federal Minister of Employment and Immigration to identify this category of trade and talent as one that is of a shortage in Canada so that we can recruit overseas.

The other thing we are doing is putting into place a computer system in the province at a cost of some \$5 million to allow us to track every elevator system in the province. So if we have a problem at one elevator, we know all of these other similar institutions and we can dispatch our inspectors to check those other institutions. In short, we are trying to do more effectively the job that the ministry and the branch have been responsible for over a number of years.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr Kormos: My question is to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Down in the Niagara Peninsula we have a whole

bunch of grape farmers, some 20 plus, who have been unfairly and arbitrarily denied assistance under the grape acreage reduction program. The rules, which were bizarre to begin with, were purportedly designed to keep out speculators. Not one of those people, not the Wileys, not Patricia Glachan and her family, not the Mikolics, not one of those farmers who seek relief can ever be described as speculators by anybody who is in his right mind. They are honest, hardworking, decent farmers who want to keep on farming their land. Why has the minister refused to participate in an alternative dispute resolution mechanism like a tripartite tribunal even when the federal government has agreed to do that to try to help those farmers?

Hon Mr Ramsay: I would be quite happy to tell the member why. Just because people have a beef with the government on a program, when you set a date, that does not necessarily mean you always have to set up some sort of independent dispute resolution mechanism.

We have an institution in this government and this province called the Ombudsman. I have encouraged these people to meet with the Ombudsman. They have done so. They have had a meeting and the Ombudsman is reserving a decision, after some investigation, as to whether he will take up the case or not. I have spoken to my colleague the Honourable Don Mazankowski and he has agreed that they should take their dispute to the Ombudsman.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr Kormos: Farmers are going to lose their farms, and it will be this minister's fault when that happens. This minister knows that the Ombudsman route is not binding on the federal government. It is not even binding on him. The Ombudsman can merely recommend. The minister knows it is going to take three, four, five years before there is any resolution. By that time, those farmers will have been put out of business and that farm land will have been turned into subdivisions one way or another.

Why will this minister not even meet with those people with a view to discussing an independent tribunal to be used as a dispute resolution mechanism? He will not even meet with them. Why not? Is he afraid of them or afraid to look them in the face?

Hon Mr Ramsay: I am quite entertained by the question. I would like to say that the Ontario Grape Growers' Marketing Board is involved in this also. This is not just a government program; this is a partnership among the federal government, the provincial government and the Ontario grape growers. Some \$39 million of government money has been spent on this program, and when you establish a program, you set a date. You do not start retroactively changing dates to accommodate people who now enter the business.

MENTAL HEALTH WORKERS

Mr McLean: My question is for the Minister of Health and it concerns 13 unclassified workers at the Oak Ridge division of the Penetanguishene Mental Health Centre who are scheduled to lose their jobs on 24 June. These workers were hired on a temporary contract while the institution tried to recruit qualified registered nurses and registered nursing assistants. The 13 workers have been praised on numerous occasions for their exemplary work. Will the minister see that these workers are retrained as registered nurses or registered nursing

assistants rather than forced to join the unemployment insurance line?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I say to the member opposite that the ministry is aware of this issue and is meeting with union officials to discuss what, if anything, can be done. The affected employees, of course, are welcome to apply for other suitable positions at the hospital.

Mr McLean: I am pleased to know that the ministry is aware of it and is working on it. It has been brought to my attention that these employees have been long-term employees and have had many commendations with regard to the work. I hope the minister will see that they will be able to be retrained in this fall semester for this year. Failing that, would the minister consider extending their contracts for another year so that they can apply to registered nursing or registered nursing assistant programs in 1991?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I want to be very clear that I am not able to give the member opposite any specific information as to what options are being considered. I know that discussions are under way. He should also know that the hospital has advertised for qualified registered nursing assistants to replace the temporary assistants.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Mr Carrothers: My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and relates to the question of privacy of personal information.

A number of constituents have spoken to me about their concerns that personal information is collected on computer data banks and then used for other purposes. As an example, the records of an individual's credit cards transactions can be compiled and sold as a series of personal profiles to potential vendors. As the minister might appreciate, someone selling jewellery might be very interested in knowing who had made large purchases of jewellery in the past. Could the minister indicate what protection a person now has in this province against personal information being used in such a fashion?

Hon Mr Sorbara: My friend the member for Oakville South raises, I think, a topic of very great significance, particularly as we develop our capacity to collect more and more data. I am not talking about the government's capacity, although the government is included in that, but the capacity of businesses of all sorts, including credit card companies, to aggregate information, analyse it from a variety of different perspectives and then market that information to retailers who might use it to sell their products, wares and services in a more effective way. In short, the question of privacy of information is going to be, I think, one of the most significant consumer issues of the 1990s and on into the next century.

My friend asked what we are doing about it currently. There are two important things to point to; first, the passage in our own government a few years back of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Most people look at the freedom of information part of that. The protection of privacy part is also very important because it ensures that government information is not subject to that kind of marketing exploitation.

1500

Mr Carrothers: I wonder if the minister might be prepared to consider passing legislation that would cause companies collecting this information to have to seek the permis-

sion of those who have given the information into the data bank before it is used for other purposes.

Hon Mr Sorbara: I think it is something that we at least have to consider. I know that my counterpart ministry in the province of Quebec has recently done a study of this whole area and is looking at options like that. Within my own ministry we are doing a number of studies that touch on this area. I do not want to suggest to my friend that they are necessarily going to end up in the form of legislation restricting the distribution of information, but we are doing a study, for example, on the electronic transfer of funds, the implications of that and the information garnered out of that, how to protect the consumer in that area.

We are also studying, along with all the other provinces in Canada, the whole business of telemarketing and how the interests of the consumer can be protected as we move into new technologies that dramatically change the way in which we market products, and of course telemarketing is one of those areas which will be front and centre in that area.

As far as passing specific legislation to restrict the distribution of information goes, I think that question will be analysed most effectively in the context of a federal-provincial assessment because, after all, in this nation we would like to see those sorts of laws harmonized.

TERMITE CONTROL

Ms Bryden: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. Toronto has been called "the edible city" in a statistical review of the very serious termite problem in this city, prepared by the city's planning department. No doubt the minister is aware that last 31 March the province cut off funding for grants to assist home owners in fighting this scourge. The grants were administered by municipal building departments and had provided up to 60% of the costs associated with termite control, to a maximum of \$2,000 per home owner.

Why does the ministry fail to recognize the very serious home owner and safety problem emerging from this scourge? Will the minister reinstate the program immediately and provide adequate funding to stop the spread of this infestation across Metropolitan Toronto and beyond?

Hon Mr Bradley: I think the member would agree with me that normally one would not expect that termite control would come under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Environment. I think the member would agree with me, though she has a specific problem within her constituency, that it would be more productive in terms of the environment for the Environment ministry to devote its funds to a number of other areas. When we were choosing areas where we could most productively expend our funds to produce the kind of environment that we would like in the province—in other words, protect the environment not only for the present but for the future—it was the feeling of the ministry that termite control would not be of the highest priority, but that if municipalities wished to carry on the program, as they have for a number of years, they are certainly welcome to do so.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Pass the buck.

Hon Mr Bradley: But I would be surprised if the member for Windsor-Riverside, for instance, would believe that the Ministry of the Environment should indeed be funding termite control, even though we are prepared to provide the kind of advice and counsel to municipalities that would like to have that in terms of the specific applications which could be made

which might be beneficial in eliminating these pests in the most expeditious manner.

MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr R. F. Nixon, in the absence of Mr Ward, moved that, notwithstanding standing order 94(h), the requirement for notice be waived with respect to ballot item 50 and that, notwithstanding standing orders 8(a) and 94(b), the House shall meet at 11 am on Thursday 17 May 1990 to consider one item of private members' business, ballot item 50.

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

BLIND PEDESTRIANS

Mr M. C. Ray: I have a petition signed by 512 people in Windsor and area from the Downtown Windsor Lions Club petitioning amendment to the Highway Traffic Act to provide for the white cane stopping law for the blind.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

Mr Wiseman: I have a petition signed by approximately 100 people in the riding of Lanark-Renfrew, and I would like to read it.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas on November 18, 1986, the French Language Services Act of Ontario had been passed in French and implementation procedures were not publicized for the awareness of the general public; and because 70 elected members were absent in the House on the above date the majority of the citizens of Ontario were not represented; and,

"Whereas at no time have the people of Ontario chosen to be officially bilingual by giving a mandate to the government or a referendum; and,

"Whereas the vast majority of Ontarians speak English fluently; and,

"Whereas the implementation of Bill 8 is proceeding with enormous cost to the taxpayers while cutbacks are being made in funding of health care, education, environment, etc; and

"Whereas one official language is a practical necessity, so we, the undersigned citizens of Ontario, hereby affirm that we desire English to be the one and only official language and furthermore, petition the government of Ontario to repeal"—

The Speaker: Order. With respect, we have a new standing order, 35, and really the member is in a way abusing that, because there is a time limit and there are only so many members. I appreciate you have had time and you have put a fair amount on the record. Next time just do not use the whereases.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr D. S. Cooke: I have a petition from the public school board in Windsor. I will not read the whereases, but they do refer to the promises by the Liberal government to come up with a 60% level of funding for public education. The petition says:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario begin immediately a program of increased funding to local school boards to ensure that it raise provincial funding levels to 60% of total costs, and that no public board suffer a net loss revenue due to the pooling of commercial and industrial assessment."

I have signed this petition. It is signed by several hundred people and I support it.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Cousens: This is a petition that I support that has been presented by students of Thornhill Secondary School on the Ontario motorist protection plan:

"To the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, hereby register our deep concern and outrage over the provisions of the new Ontario motorist protection plan. We respectfully request that the Legislature consider substantial amendment of or complete rejection of the Ontario motorist protection plan as presently proposed.

"We further respectfully request that a plan be devised more nearly in accordance with the results of the independent studies undertaken at the request of the government."

There are 100 names there and I think there is still time for the government to revise its strategies if it would pay attention to this petition.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Mr Kanter moved first reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Mr Laughren: Has this anything to do with elevators?

Mr Kanter: Since my friend asked and I believe the rules allow me a chance to explain briefly—

The Speaker: Perhaps you would let the Chair place the question.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Kanter: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to explain—

The Speaker: Order.

ONTARIO KOREAN BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION ACT, 1990

Mr McGuigan, on behalf of Mr Ruprecht, moved first reading of Bill Pr73, An Act to revive Ontario Korean Businessmen's Association.

Motion agreed to.

1510

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

INSURANCE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1989

(continued)

Consideration of Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance.

The Second Deputy Chair: It is so wonderful to be back in committee of the whole House on Bill 68.

An hon member: You've had a busy week.

The Second Deputy Chair: We will reserve comments on the weekend for another time.

Hon Mr Conway: Alan Pope may never be the same.

The Second Deputy Chair: I may never be the same.

To refresh everyone's memory, in case the members forgot, apparently the committee last sat—it just seems like yesterday but it was 28 March 1990. I want to remind everyone about the specific order. To refresh everyone's memory, let me just go through some of it unless everyone disagrees, but I think it is important to remind the members:

"That, notwithstanding any standing order or special order of the House in relation to Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance, two sessional days shall be allotted to consideration of the bill in the committee of the whole House. All amendments proposed to be moved to the bill shall be filed with the Clerk of the assembly by 5 pm on the first sessional day on which the bill is considered in the committee of the whole House."

If I am correct, this is the first sessional day. Any proposed amendments, I say to the government and anyone else who is interested, have to be in to the Chair by 5 o'clock today, which is less than two hours away.

"At 5:45 pm on the second of these sessional days, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved and the Chair of the committee of the whole House shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto and report the bill to the House. Upon receiving the report of the committee of the whole House, the Speaker shall put the question for the adoption of the report forthwith, which question shall be decided without amendment or debate."

Then we go on to third reading, which is not a particular concern of mine, but the Speaker's.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I wonder if the Chairman could explain what that motion meant.

The Second Deputy Chair: It is going to take some time, but I bet there are one or two members who would like to know what the amendments are.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Mr Chairman, maybe we could talk about stacking and whether there is going to be an arrangement for stacking of amendments as we go through this afternoon and tomorrow.

The Second Deputy Chair: I would like to say to the House leader for the official opposition that we could discuss that, but shall I just review the amendments that we have, an awful lot?

Mr Pouliot: With respect, on a point of clarification, I was listening very intently to your directives, sir, and you informed us in terms of 5 o'clock today—and it is 3:15—and 5:45 tomorrow. This is referred to as "two sessional days." Am I correct in assuming that?

The Second Deputy Chair: Correct.

Mr Pouliot: I find it somewhat appalling in terms of due process. How do you reconcile that we have 38 amendments, which will be read individually, from the government side—that is a minimum of 38 amendments—and we must allow time for debate? The loyal opposition will have some amendments, no doubt, for we are against the whole bill. The Progressive Conservative Party, the third party, will have numerous amendments, for this bill is ill-fated. That has been debated at length.

How do we deal with the debate on those amendments when there is not sufficient time to even read the amendments into the record?

The Second Deputy Chair: That is it? That is a very important inquiry. Interestingly enough, I say to the Treasurer, I have no authorization to make any comment on that. My job is just to follow the directive as put forward to me by the House, so I do not think I will recognize you. But I will recognize the honourable House leader for the third party, who seems to be anxious and wants to say something.

Mr Eves: No, I don't want to say anything at all.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Do you agree with stacking?

Mr Eves: I have no problem with stacking votes on amendments with respect to this particular piece of legislation until, I believe it would be Wednesday at 5:45 pm, if that is the wish of the other two parties.

The Second Deputy Chair: On the stacking, the Clerk very kindly was speaking while you were speaking and I missed whatever important statement you had to make, but I am sure it was worth while because we will hear from the parliamentary assistant.

Mr Ferraro: Just briefly, Mr Chairman, I would point out that there are 30 government amendments and eight amendments from the Conservative Party. Bearing in mind that we have had significant debate in the past, the very least I will pledge to do is to read our amendments quickly.

The Second Deputy Chair: And you think what?

Mr Ferraro: We support stacking as well.

The Second Deputy Chair: They support stacking.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Until when?

The Second Deputy Chair: You have not had the opportunity, have you?

Mr D. S. Cooke: I think it would be appropriate that perhaps we could stack until about 5:30 on Wednesday, since the government has 30 amendments or so. We could stack them until 5:30 and start the voting on Wednesday at 5:30. It will take us at least a half-hour to vote on all the government's amendments to correct the mess that it introduced last fall.

The Second Deputy Chair: I would like to bring to the attention of members that the order does say 5:45, but if we have agreement—

Mr D. S. Cooke: Unanimous consent.

The Second Deputy Chair: There appears to be unanimous consent in committee that we will attempt to stack votes to 5:30 the next sessional day. Are we going to do, then, the one vote on all the proposed amendments, and do it in reverse?

Mr D. S. Cooke: No, I don't think so.

The Second Deputy Chair: We are not going to do that.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Divide on each of them.

The Second Deputy Chair: So you are going to divide on each one? That is an interesting question, I say to the House leader of the official opposition. Are we going to have one bell?

They are just negotiating here in terms of how we are going to do this. While there is still some discussion, let me just review for a moment the proposed amendments.

Mr McCague: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I just wondered if it is appropriate to entertain advice from the member for Guelph when he is not in his seat.

Hon R. F. Nixon: Perhaps as acting House leader, I would request permission of the House that the honourable member, who is going to be assisting the House in dealing with some amendments, be allowed to sit in the seat he is now sitting in so that he can be close to the advice from the public servants.

The Second Deputy Chair: As efficient as our staff are here, they wanted to point out to me section 103 of our standing orders, which allows the parliamentary assistant to sit there.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Can you read it out to us, please?

The Second Deputy Chair: If you want to look at it, if you have trouble reading it, later maybe we could go over it together with you.

It seems that it would be worth while just to review the proposed amendments. We will do this as quickly as possible.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Quit wasting time. Our critic is here; let's get going.

The Second Deputy Chair: I am only trying to fulfil the job that I have responsibility for. That is to clarify and ensure that the committee of the whole House knows exactly what it is doing.

Under Bill 68, there are proposed government amendments to: section 3—6h, 6na; subsection 37(2)—98(1)(bg), (bh), (bl), (bm), (bn), (bo), (bp); subsections 45(10) and (11); section 47—208a(6), 208b(1), 208c(1), 208c(3), 208c(5); section 49—209a; section 55—230a(9).

There are third-party proposed amendments to section 57—231a(1), 231a(1)(a), 231a(1)(b), 231a(4).

There is a proposed government amendment to section 57—231a(7).

There are third-party proposed amendments to section 57—231b(1)(c), 231b(1)(d), 231b(6), 232(1a), 232(1b), 232(1c).

There are proposed government amendments to: section 57—232(2), 232(5); section 63—239a, 239b(1), 239b(4), 239b(5); section 65—242a(2), 242a(3), 242a(5), 242b(8), 242c(1a), 242e(2), 242e(3), 242f, 242g, 242h, 242k; section 74—269(5a), 372(1)(a); section 82(4); section 86(2)—4b(2); section 91.

Well, that sure is a handful. Now, we still have the question of whether the members may be called in once and all deferred divisions taken in succession. We do not know yet. I think we are going to have to look for direction on Wednesday. So let's go with the bill.

1520

Mr Ferraro: Did we get as far as section 1? We are on section 1?

The Second Deputy Chair: We are on section 1. Are you speaking to section 1 or just sort of giving general advice?

Mr Ferraro: No, Mr Chairman. With your indulgence, perhaps my hearing is going, but my staff verified that in your reading, sir, you may have incorrectly referred to one of our amendments as 269(5a) when it should be 369(5a).

The Second Deputy Chair: That is fine. Thank you for bringing that to my attention. I meant to mention that in case I misread to ensure that it was properly done. Thank you for following along. I appreciate that.

Mr Kormos: The parliamentary assistant was mumbling and I could not hear him.

Mr Ferraro: For the benefit of my friend from Welland-Thorold, Mr Chairman, I was pointing out that it was our impression that perhaps you incorrectly read into the record the wrong number of one of our amendments and it should have been 369 as opposed to 269.

The Second Deputy Chair: Okay, so we have got that clarified. Now, are there any comments or suggestions on section 1?

Mr Kormos: One moment, Mr Chairman, please. Look, we have got a whole pile of amendments here.

The Second Deputy Chair: Yes.

Mr Kormos: Let me tell you what happened in committee, Mr Chairman. The government hamstrung the committee so that it had a very limited period of time, and before we got to the crucial element of this bill, the threshold, which is what it is all about—that is the one that is going to be hammering away at innocent injured victims—we were out of time. Why, there was but perhaps half an hour for each party to address that most important matter of threshold.

I would like hear what other members have to say about this and what the parliamentary assistant has to say about it. What I would suggest is we have agreement that the next day—this is the first half-day; people are going to realize we are dealing with a whole pile of amendments and a whole lot of questions have to be asked and we have only two and a half hours left to do it, and that is what a day means in this time allocation motion—I am wondering whether there can be agreement that the first matter to be dealt with the second day, which is the last day, can be the threshold, because that is so crucial to an understanding of this legislation. I have a fear that the Liberals are going to go through amendment 1, amendment 2, etc., and they are going to be out of time before we get to the threshold, which is what this time allocation motion was all about. I am prepared to agree that the first matter to be dealt with on the second afternoon, notwithstanding that we may not have reached it, be the threshold.

Mrs Marland: I would be willing to concur with the request of the official opposition if he could just identify for me where that section comes in.

Mr Kormos: We are of course talking about those sections starting with section 57. Interestingly, the Liberals are not prepared to respond to any of the submissions made to them by way of threshold. We do not support a threshold at all; we oppose threshold. The fact is there are some amendments—not from the Liberals—that would give effect to some of the recommendations that are basically compromises. They are basically saying, "If the legislation is going to be rammed through, at least soften the blow a little bit." So it is the Tory amendments that we are talking about.

The Second Deputy Chair: I do not know. I can always fall back on what the House has directed us to do. When in doubt, just follow what they tell us. On the other hand, if there is a proposal, I would suggest that is great. Does that mean all those sections pertaining to the bill, 1 to—I will have the staff help me out here. Let's see. Are there any proposals to section 57 by the government? There are. There are lots. Are there any proposed third-party amendments? I could say, "Shall all those proposed amendments from 1 to 57 carry? Carried." Is that what you suggest I do?

Mr Kormos: Of course not. We are not even 15 minutes into this closure than we are recognizing how unfair the whole procedure is going to be, how it is going to deny any meaningful discussion of any of these amendments, even the threshold. The whole matter is almost futile.

The Second Deputy Chair: To the member for Mississauga South: He has indicated section 57. I, in my best efforts to try to facilitate matters, suggested that if that is the case, then can we at least pass all those sections from section 1 up to, but not including, section 57? That appears not to be the situation. So I do not know if we have any amicable agreement or not. My feeling is that there is not at the moment. No, the parliamentary assistant is shaking his head in the negative. That only leaves me the one alternative, and that is to continue now with section 1, unless you have something else that would shed some light on our very difficult problem.

Mrs Marland: What we are saying is that we have no willingness on the part of the government to show any co-operation now that it has anchored us down to only two days in which to deal with this legislation in committee of the whole; in fact, probably a total of five hours if we are looking at two business days. They are saying that we have to proceed through all the sections of the bill, even though it is my understanding that a lot of the Liberal amendments are housekeeping. They certainly are not the significant amendments to the significant sections that the public did demonstrate and express very real concerns in, those being the amendments to section 57, which are indeed the amendments presented to the House by the Progressive Conservative caucus.

Our concern is—and I certainly agree with the member for Welland-Thorold—that we may never get to those sections to indeed debate our amendments. Is it not significant that there are that number of amendments by the drafting party of the bill? The people who wrote the bill might have done a better job in drafting it so that we did not have to have all of those amendments that do not respond to the points, the questions and the concerns raised by the public in the public hearings.

1530

Mr Ferraro: First, let me say that it has been my experience, limited as it may be for the past five years, that 30 amendments to a major piece of legislation is not unusual. Second, it is interesting that the opposition members now are implying our unwillingness to co-operate when indeed some of the goings-on in previous weeks might have allowed more time for the clause-by-clause, but the co-operation was not prevalent in this House at that point in time. Suffice it to say that, in the government's view, we should proceed with section 1 in as orderly and as quickly a fashion as we possibly can.

The Second Deputy Chair: It would appear, parliamentary assistant, that is about what we are going to have to do. That being the case, as I am shuffling papers around frantically, the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale.

Mr Philip: I want to ask a question on section 1.

The Second Deputy Chair: Wait a minute, before we do anything else. Now we are going to start with section 1. This is it. Boom.

Section 1:

Mr Philip: My question is on the definition of "accountant." There is considerable disagreement regarding the certified general accountants. There is a new act coming out as to exactly

the certification process. I am wondering if I can ask the minister, are certified general accountants recognized in the definition of "accountant" under section 1 in the same way as chartered accountants are recognized?

Mr Ferraro: My staff indicates to me that this definition essentially is based on the licensing provisions as implied in the Public Accountancy Act, wherein an accountant must be classified as a public accountant.

Mr Philip: Would the minister like to answer my question? Are CGAs covered under this section of the act? It was a fairly simple question. I asked it six weeks ago and I still have not received a reply from either the minister or the parliamentary assistant to the minister.

Mr Ferraro: No, CGAs are not considered.

Mr Philip: May I ask why CGAs, who comprise a large professional body in this province, are being excluded by this act? We have a whole bunch of trained professionals, whom the Attorney General himself is now finally, after years of bargaining, starting to recognize as being the equivalent of CAs. Why are they not being recognized when you have a profession that our own Provincial Auditor hires on an equal basis to CAs and treats them equally?

Why are they being excluded from the definition of "accountant" under this act? Why is one branch of the government meeting with them and, albeit not saying in the exact manner which they wish, at least negotiating with them to bring in equal qualifications or an equal certification process, while at the same time excluding this group of professionals under this act?

Mr Ferraro: The reality of the situation—and I share some of the concerns expressed by the member opposite—is that the Public Accountancy Act, as I understand it, precludes CGAs from doing public audits; and that is a necessary requirement according to the Insurance Act. Subsequently, by default—and I suggest it is a matter for another day when dealing with another act—that necessitates this exclusion, if you will.

Mr Philip: I guess I am still confused. If the Provincial Auditor can hire CGAs to do audits of crown corporations and ministries, why is it then that the government feels CGAs are not competent or qualified to be covered under this act to do the kind of auditing there is in this bureaucracy which it is setting up?

Mr Ferraro: In respect to the examples from the members opposite, it is my understanding that those people who are hired by the auditor are not doing public audits per se.

Mr Philip: Six or eight weeks ago I raised this matter with the minister—with the parliamentary assistant; I could not raise it with the minister because the minister was never in the committee and he is not here today, otherwise I would raise it with him today.

CGAs often are people who do not come from an élite family of accountants, who come from working-class families and get their degrees through night courses and hard work. They often obtain their degrees in the same way in which some members in this House, myself included, received theirs: through going to night school, summer school and so forth to get an accountancy degree. Now, after years of negotiation with both the previous government and the present government, some people are actually starting to say that maybe they should be treated equally.

Six weeks ago I raised with the parliamentary assistant whether it is not possible, when one hand of the government is starting to recognize them, that at least the other hand, his ministry, might give them equal recognition? Why has the government not amended this section of the act at least to have CGAs recognized as being capable of doing audits in this case?

Mr Ferraro: Let me respond first by saying that, notwithstanding the fact that the minister was not directly present, the minister has discussed and addressed this issue essentially in weeks past. Certainly it has been discussed at length in the ministry.

The reality of the situation is that the Insurance Act requires public audits. The other reality of the situation, whether we like it or not—and I share some of the sentiments expressed by the member opposite—is that it is required by law, according to the Insurance Act, that there be public audits. According to the Public Accountancy Act, CGAs are not allowed to do public audits. I suggest this is a matter, which already has been discussed, for the Ministry of the Attorney General in that the Public Accountancy Act falls under its purview.

Mr Philip: I wonder if the parliamentary assistant can answer this question. Since I raised it with him some six weeks or more ago, did he or his ministry at any time discuss this with the Certified General Accountants' Association of Ontario, which has been around this place lobbying for what I think are some fairly legitimate changes to the Public Accountancy Act? Has he discussed it with them? Has the ministry discussed it with them? Has the ministry looked at the possibility of having CGAs included under this? The parliamentary assistant says the minister looked at it; looked at it how?

Mr Ferraro: There has been consideration of this very point, indeed precipitated by concerns expressed by the member opposite and others. Again the reality is that it falls under the auspices of another act. There have been hundreds and perhaps thousands of discussions and conversations relating to this act. I can honestly say that I have not met with the Certified General Accountants' Association. Indeed, in my humble view, it would probably be more appropriate for that discussion to take place when we are debating or considering changes to the Public Accountancy Act specifically.

The Second Deputy Chair: Any further discussion concerning section 1 of Bill 68, An Act to amend certain acts respecting Insurance?

Mr Kormos: For clarification's sake, this is clause by clause, not section by section. We are talking about subsection 1(1)—

Mr Neumann: I thought you wanted to get on with it yourself.

Mr Kormos: Mr Chairman, please listen.

If we are going to do this, we should do it in an orderly way or else chaos is going to erupt and prevail. The last thing we in this caucus want is more of the same sort of chaos that the Liberals have been generating in this province since they lost our guidance in 1987. So do we move on to subsection 1(2), or is the Chair simply going to say, "No, move on to section 2 of the bill"?

The Second Deputy Chair: I just want to plug away at this and, if we are finished with subsection 1(1), all those in favour? Carried? Carried. We will carry on to subsection 1(2).

Mr Kormos: No, wait a minute.

The Second Deputy Chair: I am just giving you the example. I am not saying it is going to happen that way.

Mr Kormos: You scared the daylight out of me. The whole bill has to be defeated.

The Second Deputy Chair: Have I answered what you asked of me?

Mr Kormos: Thank you.

1540

The Second Deputy Chair: We are still dealing with subsection 1(1). Any further discussion? I even forget how to do this. It has been such a long time. Carried? Carried. Right, it is carried.

Mr Kormos: No. We are opposed.

The Second Deputy Chair: No? Wait a minute. So are we going to have a vote? Is this it?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Here it is, from on high: I put the question for or against, and then if I say that it is passed and five members stand up, it is deferred until tomorrow at 5:30, which we have agreed to before. If five members do not stand up, that means the section is passed.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: That is fair. Gee whiz, you are really putting me in a corner on this. But okay; I mean, what difference does it make? It would appear that there was not sufficient clarification by the Chair in terms of the procedure. So continuing on then, we are with subsection 1(1).

Mr Kormos: I do not want to be an obstructionist. I want to see this developed in the most orderly way. All I want to know is whether the government is agreeable to stacking these votes to the afternoon of the second day of consideration, which is of course the last and final day of consideration, in committee of the whole. We want an opportunity to discuss it, but we have so little time—

Mr Kerrio: You're using it all up.

Mr Neumann: You're filibustering your own discussion.

Mr Kormos: Will the Chair please seize the bull by at least one horn?

The Second Deputy Chair: Right. You see, what we had previously agreed to between the House leaders was that at 5:30—remember, we changed the time from 5:45 to 5:30—we are going to ring the bells once and have all the members come in, we are going to have one vote for whatever section we are going to begin with on the amendments or whatever, members stand up and it is contested, etc. As I recall, under section 28(b), the members may be called in once and all deferred divisions taken in succession, okay? So we have the one vote and I, the Chair, will carry on with all the various problems and announce what the votes were, etc.

Mr Kormos: What I am trying to tell you, Mr Chairman, is that we are agreeable basically to deferring or stacking the votes to the end of the second day, which is the final day of consideration of clause-by-clause during committee of the

whole. We are agreeable to that in the New Democratic Party in the interests of the most efficient use of time.

The Second Deputy Chair: Let's get this straight. You are agreeable—

Mr Kormos: To stacking or deferring these votes to the end of the last day of consideration in committee of the whole.

The Second Deputy Chair: Right.

Mr Kormos: It is as simple as that.

The Second Deputy Chair: Okay.

Mr Kormos: All we need is agreement from the other two parties.

The Second Deputy Chair: We have agreed to that. We are going to have one bell at 5:30 on Wednesday. We are going to call everybody in, then I am going to go through each section that has not been passed and we are going to have a vote on those sections.

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: That is right. You see, I misunderstood. I appreciate that it is difficult for you, Mr Chairman, because you have these people, the Liberals, nattering to your right, but the impression you gave was that there were going to be two stacked votes, one on the first day and one on the second day. So that means the vote which was purportedly taken on subsection 1(1) is a nullity.

The Second Deputy Chair: Let's try. We are going to try to make it a nullity. Now we are going to start afresh. Have we got the game plan now as clear as mud?

Okay. Now we are going to go to subsection 1(1).

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

Okay. Now I say, I think, that the ayes have it. Okay. So then five people stand up. Here we go. Okay. So now I say, between agreements of the House leaders this was deferred to 5:30 pm Wednesday.

Mr Kormos: Mr Chairman, each and every one will be deferred.

The Second Deputy Chair: Try your best, yes. That is the game plan.

Mr Kormos: It is going to stay at five each time?

Mr Kerrio: See, it did not take you all that time to see how the place is run.

Mr Kormos: The place is run so poorly, because people like the member for Niagara Falls have been in the cabinet.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Subsection 1(1) has been deferred. Now we are on to subsection 1(2). Is there any discussion to subsection 1(2)?

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: Well, I am looking around. There does not appear to be.

Mr Kormos: Mr Chairman, it is important for us to know what the impact is of subsection 1(2), and I am hoping that the parliamentary assistant could put his head together with the staff people he has there with him and give us an answer as to the effect of subsection 2, which of course repeals paragraph 7 of section 1 of the existing act.

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: If the minister were here we would know; it would not be a matter of rippling through pages and taking up this time.

The Second Deputy Chair: All right. Come on, you have put the question.

Mr Ferraro: The repeal of the definition of the term "appeal"—and I will read it verbatim because I do not want the member, as perplexed as he is, to become any more perplexed—is ancillary to other changes made to the Insurance Act by Bill 68. Under the Bill 68 scheme, decisions and orders of the superintendent will generally be appealable to the commissioner, whose orders will be subject to the judicial review only. Similarly, decisions on arbitrations will be appealable to the director of arbitrations. These decisions are subject to judicial review. This procedure reflects current administrative law practice in the province of Ontario.

The Second Deputy Chair: There is the answer to the request of the honourable member for Welland-Thorold on subsection 1(2). Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favour of the section? Carried?

Mr Kormos: No.

The Second Deputy Chair: I have not even got to that.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those against please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Mr Kerrio: Right, the ayes have it.

The Second Deputy Chair: Let me see. As I am quickly looking around, I almost see five—I do see five. We have got a problem.

Mr Kerrio: You have got the problem. You do not have enough members.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: That is how I look at it. Let's carry on. Subsection 1(3). The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville, do you have any comments about subsection 1(3)?

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: It is only out of my due respect for fairness to this place that we will allow the honourable member for Welland-Thorold and the House leaders of the opposition to sort out this difficulty.

An hon member: Now he knows.

The Second Deputy Chair: He knows now; so now we are on subsection 1(3). Is there any discussion? There does not appear to be. There are a lot of amendments there. Carried?

Some hon members: No.

The Second Deputy Chair: All those in favour will please say "aye."

Mr Kormos: Wait a minute, Mr Chairman.

Interjections.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Mr Chairman, what we could do instead of dividing on subsections of the bill is wait until the section is completed and divide on each section of the bill.

The Second Deputy Chair: I was only trying to be accommodating.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: I have to defer to the House leader. Is it the pleasure of the committee that we deal with a section and not each subsection, as I was doing?

Agreed to.

The Second Deputy Chair: That solves that problem. We had only got as far as subsections 1(1) and 1(2). What do we do to correct that when we have the votes? Do we wipe that all out and go back?

Is it agreed that with subsections 1(1) and 1(2), which had been carried but a vote deferred, we will now deal just with the whole section 1? Agreed. Now we are just going to deal with section 1. Now we are starting fresh.

Mr Kormos: The same questions do not have to be asked again.

The Second Deputy Chair: They can be, but it would be nice if you did not.

1550

Mr Kormos: Let's get down to subsection 1(3). I want to know from the parliamentary assistant how much of the commission's and commissioner's powers are by statute as compared to regulatory powers to be defined post facto.

Mr Ferraro: The legal department of my ministry tells me that indeed most of the powers for the insurance commissioner are established by statute. Indeed, it is somewhat difficult to give powers if they are not based in statute.

The Second Deputy Chair: We are still dealing with section 1.

Mr Kormos: I understand that. I am wondering if the regulatory outline of the role of commissioner is complete. If it is complete, is it available?

Mr Ferraro: I am not exactly sure—does the member mean the regulations accompanying Bill 68? Is that what he is referring to?

Mr Kormos: The member should know what I mean. I do not mean the so-called no-faults. That is part of the problem with closure. Those guys have no idea of how incomplete this stuff is. Then they try to ram it through in two afternoons and they are left with this sort of slipshod mishandling of an important bill.

Now, I have to put a question. I wish I could ask this question of the minister, but the minister did not want to show up for the committee hearings and now he does not want to show up for committee of the whole. I want to know if the regulations that specify the powers of the commission and the commissioner are complete.

Mr Ferraro: After having participated in this process with the member for Welland-Thorold for many months now, I admittedly say that I am still not sure as to where he is coming from. Suffice it to say that the powers of the commissioner of insurance are embedded in statute. Indeed, the regulations would then subsequently be passed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. If the question is—and I think it is—are all the

regulations present in which that individual and his association can function, at this point in time the answer is yes.

Mr Philip: Subsection 1(3) deals with the appointment of the commissioner, the director, and then it refers to section 6, where he in turn has authority to appoint a whole bunch of other people. One of the concerns I expressed in this act was the whole bureaucracy that this act is establishing and how much it would cost the taxpayer. At the time I asked the parliamentary assistant, in the absence of the minister, how much all of this would cost, he was not able to give me an answer. I wonder if he can now tell us exactly what positions there are going to be in this new bureaucracy that he is setting up, what the salaries will be for each of those positions, and what he estimates the total cost of this massive bureaucracy is that he is about to establish under subsection 1(3) and section 6 of the act.

The Second Deputy Chair: Are we at section 6 already?

Mr Philip: No. Subsection 1(3) refers to section 6.

Mr Ferraro: In committee, when we were dealing with that shortly after the original question was posed, we came up with a figure that I think was somewhere around \$11 million. That \$11 million was essentially the cost of the department of insurance/superintendent of insurance as it exists now. I say to the member now that there is no further definitive amount indicating the exact cost of the commission, mindful of the fact that indeed the bill has not been passed yet so the commission is not even in existence.

The other point I wish to point out is that indeed, as is the case in all ministries when you develop commissions, these figures will become public when indeed they are available.

Mr Philip: Mr Chairman, I know that it will not be new to you that I ask these questions over and over again with different acts, but I find it offensive to pass legislation without knowing what it is going to cost the taxpayer.

Now the parliamentary assistant says it is going to cost \$11 million, but he is not quite sure. I have asked the question as to exactly would the minister now at least name the different posts that he is appointing under this and tell us the salary or salary ranges for each of these positions so that we may know exactly what kind of a system he is setting up. Who are these people? For example—let's take them one at a time—what is the salary of the commissioner going to be? Then, what is the salary of the director going to be? Then, what are each of the positions that the director is going to appoint?

Mr Kormos: And is Mr DelZotto appointed.

Mr Philip: No, that will be my next question.

What exactly are the costs of each of those posts? Would he tell the House that?

Mr Ferraro: I repeat that indeed Mr Scott, who is going to be the insurance commissioner, in conjunction with his duties is in the process of developing his personnel, if you will. There are no specific allocations as yet to any position, and indeed until the bill is passed I suggest it would be somewhat premature. Admittedly he is contemplating his staffing, and as soon as they are available I undertake to provide same to the member opposite.

Mr Philip: Would the parliamentary assistant tell us what Mr Scott is going to be paid?

Mr Ferraro: Suffice to say I do not have the aggregate amount. He is going to be paid on a per diem basis. I am told

that it is approximately \$140,000 per year for that position and, might I say, significantly higher than what MPPs get.

Mr Philip: One hundred and forty thousand dollars a year? I am sure some of the people who are so concerned about their auto insurance are going to be really pleased about that. The director will not be a per diem, I assume. What will his salary be?

Mr Ferraro: The director is a lady. Her salary is unknown to me, but I will try to ascertain that and provide it as soon as possible.

Mr Philip: I assume that the parliamentary assistant meant that the director is a woman and not a lady. Whether she is a lady or not is her personal business and of no concern to me.

What I am concerned about is exactly how much she is going to be paid. Can the parliamentary assistant to the minister tell us what the total salary component will be of this \$11-million bureaucracy that he now says he is going to set up?

Mr Ferraro: Not at this time.

Mr Philip: We have asked for this literally months ago in committee. We have asked for it months ago because the concerns that I expressed—and indeed my colleague in the Conservative Party, the member for Leeds-Grenville, had similar concerns—are that the government is setting up a huge bureaucracy that is going to cost the taxpayers a lot of money with no apparent benefits for it, and the least we can do before we vote for it, since we are voting on what amounts to a money bill, is to know how much the cost of this is.

The minister is saying a ballpark figure of \$11 million, but he is not sure—well, now he is sure. Now he comes up with a figure. The commissioner is going to get \$140,000 a year. One can assume then that the director—who the minister says is a lady, and I assume he means it is a woman—is going to be paid somewhat less. Yet the minister has not even budgeted his total salary component for a bill that he is asking us to pass. I ask how the minister can justify that.

1600

Mr Ferraro: If I offended anybody by referring to the director as a lady, I apologize, but I say it is much more acceptable in my mind to call the woman a lady than to call the woman a man, as the member opposite did.

Mr Philip: I believe that I called the director a person. Perhaps the parliamentary assistant is not too concerned about people. It is fairly obvious that he did not listen to the people or the persons who appeared before the committee.

Would the parliamentary assistant tell us exactly what the procedure will be of appointing this commissioner, since it is after all a quasi-judicial function, and tell us exactly how much advertising will be done, whether it is open to the public or whether it is just another one of those patronage positions that this government seems to be intent on giving to different people?

Mr Ferraro: The process is that Mr Scott, who is only acting, if you will, in an interim position as commissioner, will be appointed by order in council, as is the norm around here for such positions with the government.

Mr Philip: Maybe it would be enlightening to the viewers to find out exactly how Mr Scott was appointed to the acting position. Would the parliamentary assistant care to share that with us?

Mr Ferraro: It is my understanding, keeping in mind the importance of insurance in the province of Ontario today, that the government did a thorough search of candidates who would be experienced to some degree, qualified, and indeed, after having looked at many, many candidates, was fortunate enough to acquire someone of the stature of Donald Scott, who is the past chairman of Clarkson Gordon and a very capable individual.

Mr Philip: I am not in any way commenting on the quality of Mr Scott. What I am concerned about is the process. I would ask, since the parliamentary assistant says that several candidates were considered, can he tell us exactly what the process was of arriving at this particular appointment, which pays \$140,000 of the taxpayers' money for this quasi-judicial position? Were there advertisements placed in the financial papers or in the daily papers? Was this competition open to people who may hold high positions in other government bureaucracies in other provinces? Were there advertisements made known through the various professional associations? Was there any kind of advertisement in the various professional journals, such as the accounting journals or the law journals? Were any of those done to ensure that there was a fair and open competition for this \$140,000 position?

Mr Ferraro: I cannot stand here and honestly say that all of those things, as alluded to by the member opposite, were done. I can say, however, that in a position of this sort there was a wide canvas from the standpoint of the ministry, that indeed several qualified individuals were contemplated and that we were very fortunate, as I say, to have a man of Mr Scott's character apply and indeed fill the position on an interim basis.

I might also say, in response to the member opposite, that he will know there is a concern out there by all people about patronage and that indeed, as has been the case in the past, many individuals of all political stripes, albeit they are qualified, have been appointed to government positions. Perhaps that is a subject for another day.

Mr Philip: Is there a job description that was circulated? Can we see a copy of that job description? Can we see exactly what the criteria were for evaluating those several—the member says “several.” Several can mean three or it could mean two dozen. Can he tell us exactly what the job description was? Can he give us a copy of that job description and the evaluation that he did in looking at the “several” applicants?

Mr Ferraro: I will see if indeed there is a finalized job description. I can only tell the member that Mr Scott at this point in time is working under a cloud somewhat, from the standpoint that the bill has not been passed, and yet, at the same time, in conjunction with the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board, is in the process of developing, if you will, to a greater degree the mandate of the commissioner above and beyond the requirements as elucidated in previous discussions, which are onerous in themselves.

Mr Philip: If I may, on the same point, the minister says the bill has not been passed, but the fact is that he just argued earlier that the position of commissioner is in fact appointed. So surely he would have a job description. He says “several.” Exactly how many people were interviewed? How many applicants were considered for this position? It is a \$140,000 position.

Mr Ferraro: He is not appointed, per se, as the bill has not passed, as the member certainly knows. He is acting on an interim basis, bearing in mind the time lines and the require-

ments that would be necessitated in order to implement this bill, assuming it passes, which hopefully it will this week. But in response to the member opposite, I will see what I can do in getting that information, if I can.

Mr Philip: The parliamentary assistant says that he is not appointed yet until after the bill has passed. Earlier he said, "Well, this is the person who is the acting person and is going to be, after the bill has passed, the de facto commissioner." All I am asking is for a very simple thing: How many people were interviewed? What process was used so that all the best possible candidates would have an opportunity to compete for this position? What is the job description? What are the criteria that were used to decide on this acting position, since he seems intent on making the acting commissioner the real or de facto commissioner after the bill has passed? Since we asked for this information some six weeks ago, why is it that he is promising the same information today that he promised six weeks ago?

Mr Ferraro: I do not recall suggesting six weeks ago that I was going to get him that specific information. If indeed I said so, maybe Hansard will indicate same. Having said that, I will undertake to get, if possible, the information as requested.

Mr Kormos: We have to sit here and listen to the parliamentary assistant's piffle. We listen to piffle, we listen to more piffle and we listen to more piffle. He knew weeks ago that these matters were of concern to members of this assembly. Many of these same questions were asked in committee. He could not answer them then. Would the parliamentary assistant please tell us why he would even think of coming to this committee of the whole without some of the material that is being requested of him?

Mr Ferraro: Suffice it to say that knowing full well that the members opposite were lying awake at night concerned about this issue distresses me no end. Having said all that, I can only say that indeed if it was that important, perhaps some of the goings-on in the previous weeks could have been dispensed with in order that we could indeed address that specifically.

1610

Mr Philip: It was of concern to the taxpayer. I had several calls when I asked those questions six weeks ago in the committee. The parliamentary assistant promised to get the information for us then. He has not obtained the information; he is making us the same silly promises now that he made us six weeks ago. Why should I believe now that I will get the information when he promised me the same thing six weeks ago and did not deliver the goods?

How dare he come back six weeks later when he has made a promise to this committee, to the public, to the taxpayers, that he would provide this information. He has had all of this time to get it and he has the audacity to come in without the information. Either he is incompetent, the minister is incompetent or they do not know what this bill is going to cost.

The parliamentary assistant has absolutely no idea what the bureaucracy that he is setting up is going to cost the taxpayers and he does not even have the courtesy to tell us how many positions there are or even the process of appointing these people to these high-paying positions. He does not have the courtesy to even tell us what the salary will be for each of these high-paying positions with the exception of one. How can the public help but think that he has sold out to the insurance companies and now it is setting up a huge patronage system for his friends? That is all that we can conclude.

Mr Ferraro: Suffice to say that it befuddled me, quite frankly, that the member was hung up on this issue. If he was so concerned about it, he certainly could have—and I certainly do not recall making the commitment that I would get back to him specifically—but during that period, I did not get so much as a phone call from the member indicating his concern in that regard. I would have made a more direct attempt to try to alleviate his concerns.

To suggest that Mr Scott is a patronage appointment I think is totally unfair and unkind on the part of the member. I feel badly that some acquaintances of the member opposite were not apprised of the situation. All I can say is that we have tried to get the information as quickly as possible.

I should point out for the benefit of the taxpayer that indeed all costs associated with the commission will be charged back to the insurance companies per se and indeed will be charged subsequently to the premium payer. In that regard, I stand by our commitment that indeed premiums will on average only increase 8% in urban areas and 0% in all other areas. So we are mindful of the taxpayers' dollars.

The Second Deputy Chair: How about the member for Leeds-Grenville? Do you want to share something with us?

Mr Runciman: It is the same subject essentially. I just want to put on the record that the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale was mentioning something like six weeks ago when this was raised. But I want to point out that I initially raised this whole question of the size of the bureaucracy and the cost to taxpayers or to consumers, if the parliamentary assistant wants to indicate that, in December 1989 in the first meeting of the standing committee with the deputy minister, Mr Simpson, appearing before us.

As you may recall, Mr Chairman, and hopefully the parliamentary assistant recalls, the government originally intended to have this legislation passed by December 1989. When I asked the deputy in the meeting in December what shape the bureaucracy was going to take, what number of employees we were looking at in terms of expansion of the civil service, what kind of costs were going to be associated with this, the deputy minister, almost five months ago, had no handle on that.

Now we are looking at five months down the road, with the passage of this legislation imminent—this Thursday I gather, because of the government's efforts to cut off debate—and we are being told again today that the government still does not have any handle on this. That is alarming. It is a frightening prospect for all of us as taxpayers and consumers in this province, and again it is indicative of the fact that this government is flying by the seat of its pants from one crisis to another. They really do not have a handle on this, as we have seen in so many other instances in respect to auto insurance in this province in the last two and half years.

The parliamentary assistant can stand up and say that this is all going to go back to the insurance industry and that the industry is going to pass it on to the consumers. Is that suppose to alleviate our concern? I do not think so at all. In fact, what it does it heighten our concern, because what he is saying is: "We don't know what it is going to cost, but don't be concerned because the insurance industry is going to pay for this and ultimately the consumers are going to pay for this. Don't be concerned about it just because we don't have any idea what it's going to cost."

He is saying that simply because it is going to ripple back to the consumers, we in the opposition party and millions of drivers across this province should not be concerned. We were

concerned in December and we are concerned in the middle of May, when this legislation is about to pass, that the government has no idea what it is going to mean to us as consumers.

Mr Ferraro: I beg to differ with the member opposite. I can tell the House without hesitation that the concern about bureaucracy is not a unilateral concern on the part of any specific individual or party in the House. Indeed, members on the government side have expressed over and over their concern about unnecessary bureaucracy, unnecessary costs.

Having said all that, we have a major piece of legislation that is going to significantly alter the way we do auto insurance in the province of Ontario. Having said that as a basis, there is a requirement that in establishing a strong watchdog agency, an amalgam if you will—

Interjections.

Mr Ferraro: What I was going to conclude was that indeed there is going to be a significant change in the way we do business in auto insurance in the province of Ontario, a significant and better way in my view, in the way we scrutinize insurance companies and indeed enforce many of the regulations and aspects of Bill 68. As a result, there is a requirement that some employees be hired. That is only natural. If you have laws, you have to enforce them and supervise them in the interests of the consumers, the 6.2 million drivers in Ontario. To suggest otherwise is totally irrational.

The only thing I would say in conclusion is that with the amalgam of the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board and the department of insurance, and indeed with the onset of the passage of this bill, all information, including costing and specific salaries therein for the specific positions, will be made public for all to see and deal with.

Mr Philip: I listened carefully to the member for Leeds-Grenville's comments. He reminds me of the comments of the Russians, who claim that they invented the telephone first.

The fact is that I raised this issue of the bureaucracy and the cost of bureaucracy when it was on second reading. I then raised it again in committee six weeks ago. In both cases, the ministry said that it intended to get back to us with the figures. Now today they are claiming that they do not know what the figures are. One has to ask—now the parliamentary assistant says, "You didn't write me a letter."

The way in which we ask for things around here is that we put it on the record and we assume that when a minister or the parliamentary assistant says, "Yes, I will get that information for you," he will keep his promise. Writing a letter often does not get any kind of results. I have written to the Attorney General on several occasions. You are lucky if you get a response in six months from that particular minister. Hopefully the Minister of Financial Institutions is a little better at responding.

My question to the parliamentary assistant on this is, since he says that somehow this bureaucracy will not cost the taxpayers anything because it comes out of the insurance companies—

Mr Ferraro: I did not say that.

Mr Philip: Is that not what he said? Then would he like to repeat exactly what he said?

Mr Ferraro: I will be happy to repeat what I said.

First of all, while I am on my feet, may I say with respect to the member opposite, if I undertake to make a commitment to him, as is my practice as an individual, I usually keep that

commitment as best I can. I say to the member opposite I do not recall specifically receiving a request for that specific information from me directly. Had I done so, Mr Chairman—I ask that you look in Hansard and I will stand corrected.

Having said all that, in dealing with the question specifically, what I said was that the costs for the department of insurance, the insurance commission will be charged back to the insurance company, which in turn is charged to the consumers, the drivers of Ontario. That is what I said.

1620

Mr Philip: That is what I heard the parliamentary assistant say and I think that was what I was reflecting. That is the same argument that was made with the travel industry compensation fund, and we are now seeing that the costs of our air travel are going to increase because this government has not been able to correctly monitor people in that business either.

I wonder if the parliamentary assistant can tell us this: How much exactly in dollars is going to be removed now from the budget of the superintendent of insurance as a result of all these cost savings or the movement of positions over into this new commission that he is setting up?

Mr Ferraro: I cannot give those figures to the member at this point in time.

Mr Philip: Can he give us the assurance that the budget of the superintendent of insurance next year will be at least \$11 million—which he has given us as a ballpark figure for the cost of this operation—less than it is this year?

Mr Ferraro: No, I cannot.

Mr Philip: How can he have an operation like this? My goodness, if he were running a business, we would be bankrupt right now. He only has X number of dollars, he does not know how much this is going to cost him and he says, "Well, I am going to take the money out of this thing, but no, I don't guarantee then that once I take X number of dollars out of this, they are not going to still have the X number of dollars at the expense of the taxpayers to run their operations."

He has absolutely no studies. What value-for-money studies, for example, may have been done by the superintendent of insurance to find out exactly how much money would be saved, at least in that particular office, as a result of this legislation? How much money are they going to save over there in the superintendent of insurance's office since it is going to cost us \$11 million on the other side?

Mr Ferraro: I can only say in response that I do not have a specific figure. But let me just say that the superintendent of insurance's office will be amalgamated into the new insurance commissioner's office along with the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board. Quite frankly, I doubt whether in fact it is going to result in savings. Every new venture of this magnitude requires, particularly in its formative years, a significant civil service to deal with the adjustment period. But I do say without equivocation that all these figures will be made public for the opposition and the taxpayers of Ontario to scrutinize and to decide whether or not it is exorbitant or worth while or unnecessary.

Mr Philip: I wonder if the parliamentary assistant can tell us this. He cannot tell us how much it is going to cost in terms of salaries. I wonder if he can tell us in terms of accommodation costs. What is the difference in terms of its accommodation costs that this new commission is going to take? Where is it going to be located? Are they going to use exactly the same

offices? Are they going to require additional office space? What is the cost of this additional office space? Would he give us a dollar figure on that?

Mr Ferraro: I cannot say definitively. However, I can say that it is my understanding that the new superintendent of insurance offices are going to be located, I think, at Park Home, where the OAIB is presently situated.

The Second Deputy Chair: Just before we continue, one of the members in the chair, the member for Oshawa, was always concerned that questions and answers should be directed through the Chair. The parliamentary assistant has been very good at that. The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale has been standing directly. Actually, I do not mind particularly; it saves some time. But at some time, if we are all getting a little testy, I might have to do that. I am just putting up the warning sign to let people know that if it gets out of hand, I will ask, but at the moment we seem to be getting on reasonably well.

Mr Philip: Has there been a lease agreement signed? If so, for how much? How much space has been rented initially for this new bureaucracy that is being setting up?

Mr Ferraro: I do not have the specifics on that, but I will endeavour to get it for the member.

Mr Philip: We are being asked to pass a bill. In the first section of the bill, we already see that it may be \$11 million, but that probably is only salaries. We are not quite sure what the salaries are. Now we do not know what the real estate cost of this bureaucracy is going to be. We are told that the parliamentary assistant thinks it is going to be a particular location.

We do not know whether there is going to be a lease signed, whether the lease has been signed, whether the location has been tendered, whether they are taking over old leases. Do I take it from the parliamentary assistant's answer—and it is very hard to take anything from him—that the present location of the superintendent of insurance will be vacated, and therefore the staff will be moved into the new location? Is that the understanding?

Mr Ferraro: Yes.

Mr Philip: In light of this government's bad record at vacating leases, can the parliamentary assistant tell us whether or not there is any loss to the taxpayer as a result of the superintendent of insurance vacating the present premises? I assume that there is a lease or lease agreement of some sort on those premises.

Mr Ferraro: In my view, there will not be a loss to the taxpayer. I cannot specifically address that situation. Suffice it to say that if there is a leasing arrangement made between the government and a landlord, that leasing arrangement will have to be dealt with. I do not have the specifics on that leasing arrangement.

Mr Philip: In the past, this government has squandered millions of dollars, and the Provincial Auditor has pointed it out, in terminating lease agreements, because there are penalty clauses in the lease agreements or because in some instances the government signed a lease agreement a long time ago and, in vacating that lease agreement, it is in fact giving a tremendous gift to the developer.

What I am asking the parliamentary assistant to tell me is whether there is a lease on the present premises of the superintendent of insurance, whether that lease has a penalty clause in it of any kind and what is happening when the superintendent of insurance moves to the new location and becomes somehow

gobbled up or amalgamated into this new bureaucracy that the government is setting up.

Mr Ferraro: Perhaps I can alleviate some of the concerns of the member opposite in that my staff has received an update that admittedly I was not aware of. The total budget for the insurance commission is \$19.6 million. Salaries are estimated at \$6.9 million, a total staff of approximately 208 employees, which is an increase of approximately 50 positions over the current number of employees between the department of insurance that now exists and the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board.

The entire cost is recoverable in the scenario presented whereby it is charged back to the insurance companies which, no doubt, will charge it to some degree in their premiums. Therefore, in that regard I can say that there is actually a savings to the overall taxpayers of the province from the standpoint of the negotiation, if you will, of the salaries of the superintendent of insurance's department in the Ministry of Financial Institutions. However, that cost will be, as I say, incurred by the insureds of the province of Ontario.

Six or seven people were considered and interviewed for the position of commissioner, and the real estate cost is consolidated, as I have indicated, at 5 Park Home at an annual rent, which is also recoverable, of approximately \$1.2 million.

Mr Philip: The parliamentary assistant is giving me those figures fairly quickly, so let me recycle them to him and see—

Mr Ferraro: Before it was not quick enough.

Mr Philip: Well, he obviously did not have the answers a few minutes ago; now he thinks that he has the answers. He says that the present bureaucracy in the superintendent of insurance's department is \$6 million in terms of staff and \$19.6 million—

Mr Ferraro: No, no. That's not what I said.

Mr Philip: How much exactly is the ministry paying for staff now in the present bureaucracy of the superintendent of insurance?

Mr Ferraro: I do not have the annual statement or definitive breakdown of the costs of my ministry at hand—I can get the member that information—but perhaps I can clarify.

Again, the total budget for the insurance commission is estimated at \$19.6 million, of which the salary component is \$6.9 million. Indeed, the amount of money that is expended now for the superintendent of insurance office, which I believe is something like \$11 million, will be a saving to the taxpayers of Ontario in that regard.

1630

Mr Philip: Would the parliamentary assistant give me exactly how many staff there are now in the Superintendent of Insurance operation and what the salary is now? He should give us those exact figures.

Mr Ferraro: Let me try to clarify to a greater degree. The \$11 million approximately now is the combined cost of the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board and the department of insurance that exists presently in the Ministry of Financial Institutions. I apologize if I confused the member earlier. Approximately 70% cent of that, which would be \$7.5 million, would be accountable as a cost for the department of insurance in the ministry now.

I think the member's question specifically was related to the exact number of positions. We anticipate a total staff of, as I

said, 208 employees, which is an increase over the amalgam, if you will, of those employed presently in the superintendent's office at the ministry and the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board of approximately 50 positions.

Mr Philip: So am I correct to say that if we divide 50 into the increased cost of this bureaucracy, I should at least get an average salary? Is that what I would come up with?

Mr Ferraro: That would be totally correct in that we are dealing with an aggregate cost for the insurance commission, which would deal with things such as materials that would need to be provided for the staffing and indeed anything else that is required in order to operate effectively.

Mr Philip: But the figures that I asked for were not the total operational costs but rather the salary costs. How would the costs of paper, pencils, whatever it is, the administrative extras, telephones, be included in the salary costs? I just do not understand the parliamentary assistant's answer.

Mr Ferraro: The figures were not necessarily—I do not think you can relate them. The \$11 million was for the total cost, including telephones, paper and pens and so forth. The other figure I referred to was \$19.6 million, which included the same, and then a breakdown specifically of salaries of \$6.9 million. I never gave the member the salary costs of the superintendent's office as it exists now or of the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board's salary costs specifically, so his reference to a relation is not based on any real comparison.

Mr Philip: Would the parliamentary assistant then give us a breakdown exactly of the \$19.6 million?

Mr Ferraro: Anything further than the distinction between the total operating costs and the salary costs is not available at this point in time.

Mr Philip: May I ask why? Since we are passing the legislation, it would be a nice idea to know exactly how we are spending the money.

Mr Ferraro: I will attempt to get that information as quickly as possible.

Mr Kormos: I want to talk about rates.

The Second Deputy Chair: Which section is that in?

Mr Kormos: We are dealing with subsection 1(3).

The Second Deputy Chair: Paragraph 56a.

Mr Kormos: You have it, Mr Chairman. Subsection 1(3).

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: Well, you have to turn the page. I want to know, because it talks about rates being "expressed in dollar terms or in some other manner," how a rate could ever be expressed in any way other than dollar terms. Are we going to talk about foreign currency or are the rates going to be some sort of secret process?

Could the minister—there I go again. We always expect the minister to be available for some commentary, but he did not show up during committee and now he does not show up during committee of the whole with the parliamentary assistant, the member for Guelph, whom the minister has forced to be here today because the minister wants to distance himself from this legislation. Would that parliamentary assistant please explain how rates could be expressed in a term other than dollar terms?

Mr Ferraro: Initially, let me say that I am indebted to the minister for giving me the enjoyable opportunity of being here today. Not only is it enjoyable, but I find it very penitential.

I am not sure I can appropriately answer the member, so I will rely on the brains in the ministry, if I may. Rates are sometimes expressed in percentage terms, for example, as opposed to a dollar classification. We all know that, to use the analogy, seniors get discount rates of 10% on certain things.

Mr Kormos: We are going to stick with this. Is he suggesting that rates will be expressed at any point in a term other than in dollars and cents, other than in dollar terms?

Mr Ferraro: I am sorry, I think the member asked the same question, in which case I will respond. Other than dollar terms, you can have percentages; for example, a 10% discount for seniors.

Mr Kormos: The section talks about "Rate"...means all amounts payable...expressed in dollar terms or in some other manner." Is the amount payable going to be expressed in anything other than dollar terms, and can the parliamentary assistant please be specific with examples about how it is going to otherwise be expressed?

Mr Ferraro: Other than indicating that "rate" can be an expression other than dollar terms, indeed in percentage forms, the only thing I can say is that "rate" is a definition and part of the legal requirement of establishing a statute is that sometimes things that seem very simple must be convoluted to some degree in order to satisfy the judicial system that exists in our province.

If I may, as well, with the indulgence of the member opposite, I have been given some additional information dealing with the budget that may be of interest to the members opposite.

Mr Philip: Why not? I have a bunch of figures; may as well get some more.

Mr Ferraro: Okay, dealing with the year 1988-89, the insurance division, which is the superintendent's office and other offices in the ministry now, cost \$4.7 million to the taxpayers of Ontario, of which \$2.8 million comprised the salaries. The Ontario Automobile Insurance Board during that same period cost \$6.4 million for an aggregate, obviously, between the two of \$11.1 million. Of that \$6.4 million, specifically \$2.2 million was allocated for salaries. There is an increase of \$8 million in 1990, obviously to account for the aggregate of \$19.6 million.

Dealing specifically with the number of employees, another question that was asked by the member opposite, the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board had 47 and the superintendent's office had 100 employees. I remind the House and the member opposite that it is anticipated that 208 employees will comprise the new Ontario Insurance Commission.

Mr Kormos: Let's get back to rates. It says they can be expressed in dollar terms. That is as if your premium is going to be \$2,000 or \$3,000 or, more likely, \$4,000 or \$5,000, because we know that the minister has already promised premium increases of up to 50 per cent and, for some third of a million people, premium increases of as high as 80 per cent. But it says "expressed in dollar terms or in some other manner."

I appreciate the parliamentary assistant answering my good friend the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, but he did not answer my request that he be specific in an example of how rates could be expressed "in some other manner," other than dollar terms. Will he give us a "for example" so that we will know what we are dealing with here.

1640

Mr Ferraro: I am not sure I am going to be able to satisfy the member opposite; I am not sure anyone can, Mr Chairman. Suffice it to say it was my understanding that the rate will be essentially in a dollar-and-cent category or in a percentage category.

For example, we have said on this side that with the passage of this bill there will be an average increase of 8% in urban areas to the existing premium, bearing in mind that if we did not pass this bill we would be substantially over 30%, and that indeed in other areas there will be a 0% increase, and the member is quite right. As in the case of all averaging, some people will have increases substantially higher than 8% and, indeed, a large portion of the 6.2 million drivers will have substantial decreases in the same amount. But indeed, just to reiterate, it can be either in a dollar-and-cent form or percentage form.

Mr Kormos: Now that we are on that, let's ask the parliamentary assistant how many drivers are going to enjoy decreases in their insurance premiums once this bill is passed. Surely, if the government can tell the public that drivers are going to face premium increases of up to 50%, it must know which ones are going to go up and which ones are going to go down. How many drivers are going to enjoy premium decreases as the parliamentary assistant just spoke of them?

Mr Ferraro: I will endeavour to see if I can be more specific with an answer, but let me say this. My staff will endeavour to get that information specifically for him.

Mr Kormos: You don't have it.

Mr Ferraro: But let me say this: There will be thousands and thousands of people who will receive—equally significant, if you will—50% reductions in their premiums.

Mr Kormos: Fifty per cent.

Mr Ferraro: Indeed, there will be averaging, and I reiterate, 8% on average in urban areas and 0% in other areas. And I will say that if this bill does not get passed, never mind the 300,000 people who, as a result of their driving record and indeed other circumstances, will be paying exorbitant premiums, if you will, by normal standards.

Mr Kormos: Shameful.

The Acting Chair (Mr Polsinelli): Order.

Mr Ferraro: But six million, or 5.5 million people, will be forced to pay 30% increases, at the very least, if this bill does not get passed.

The Acting Chair: Keep in mind, the member for Welland-Thorold particularly, that when he is placing his questions, I am finding that very few members, if any, interrupt. I would ask him to extend the same courtesy to other members when they are responding.

Mr Kormos: The Liberals' embarrassment about this bill is their problem. The parliamentary assistant talked about thousands of people who were going to enjoy decreases of up to 50%. Would he please describe the driver who is going to get a 50% premium decrease. This one we have to hear.

The Acting Chair: Does the parliamentary assistant wish to answer that?

Mr Kormos: We know that the Chairman cannot force people to answer questions.

The Acting Chair: Order.

Mr Ferraro: The only thing I would say to the member opposite is that, first, this government is not embarrassed whatsoever by this legislation.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Well, you should be.

Mr Ferraro: In fact, we are very proud of it, and I say that quite openly and without hesitation.

At this juncture, I cannot be specific with regard to the member's request for that. I should perhaps, with respect, indicate that I may have been erroneous when I suggested that people will have 50% reductions. However, I may be correct in that regard.

I can say, however, because we are averaging, that there will be a significant number of people who will have reductions. The exact degree may be less than 50%, it may be greater than 50%. In fairness to the member opposite, I should clarify that point. But again, I reiterate that there is averaging involved and, as is the case with averaging, there are, if you will, some winners and, unfortunately, some losers.

The Acting Chair: I would remind the members of the House that we are dealing with subsection 1(3) of Bill 68 which is, in the opinion of the Chair, a definition section.

Section 56a, which has been discussed at length, is dealing with the definition of "rate" and I would ask that the members confine their remarks to the section presently under discussion.

Mr Kormos: Mr Chairman, you will recall that the parliamentary assistant introduced the matter of premium decreases to the discussion of rate, so I am afraid that the government cannot have its cake and eat it too. We are talking about rates in dollar terms. We are talking about rates as consisting, among other things, of commissions, surcharges, fees, discounts, rebates and dividends. The parliamentary assistant said that some drivers will enjoy premium decreases of up to 50%. He then said he might have been erroneous when he said that.

He relies on this average, but it takes numbers to create an average. How can this parliamentary assistant dare speak of averages when he has not got the slightest idea, he has not got the inkling of an idea, he has not got the tiniest idea of the facts that give rise to his bold and possibly equally erroneous statements about 8% averages?

Now, he should come off it. What is the parliamentary assistant relying on when he feeds us this guff about there being premium decreases? Who are the drivers who are going to enjoy premium decreases—the ones who sell their cars and stop driving? Just who are those people?

Mr Ferraro: Let me see if I can attempt to make the member happy, which I think is a very bold statement initially.

By way of an example, let's just see for a minute. Let's take a young male from Welland-Thorold who drives a Corvette, who perhaps is a member of a particular party. There is no doubt that member will experience an increase as a result of the fact that he drives a much more expensive car, that being a Corvette.

On the other end of the spectrum, the people who will likely get a saving would be, for example, someone who drives a less expensive car in a rural area, in particular a senior who does not drive that often.

Perhaps to be a little more specific, I can give a delineation as was handed out to all members of the committee, an impact analysis summary based on policyholders, as opposed to percentage increases. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, perhaps

the member opposite would like me to read this. I am assuming he would. We are talking of percentage change in premiums—

The Acting Chair: Order. We are talking about a definition section, and if the member for Welland-Thorold and the parliamentary assistant and the other members of the House want to spend the afternoon debating the bill again under this section, they are free to do so. But the Chair would ask that you should confine your remarks to the section presently under discussion. I am sure that if we could proceed with the bill—there are many opportunities under the various sections to discuss all the points that we should be discussing, but I am in the hands of the House.

Mr Philip: Mr Chairman, on a point of order: Under this section, "rate" is defined as "in relation to automobile insurance, means all amounts payable under contracts of automobile insurance for an identified risk exposure whether expressed in dollar terms or in some other manner and includes commissions, surcharges, fees, discounts, rebates and dividends." Mr Chairman, since the rate is a really important issue in this bill, can you tell us under what section I might raise the increases that my constituents and those, indeed, in all of the Metropolitan Toronto area are going to have to pay as a result of this increase in the legislation? Can you point out the section to me? I will be happy to raise it under that section.

1650

The Acting Chair: The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale will know that it is not the Chair's responsibility to explain the bill to him. He may want to ask the member for Welland-Thorold, who is his party's critic on this. I am simply suggesting that for the members of the House who want to participate in the discussion, they may want to confine their remarks to the section under discussion. If they want to expand their remarks, they are free to do so. I am merely making a suggestion and I am in the hands of the members of the House. The member for Guelph had the floor.

Mr Philip: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: You suggested that we should not be raising these issues under this section.

The Acting Chair: That is not a point of order.

Mr Philip: I am saying if there is another section, then I would be willing to accept your recommendation. Just tell me what other section deals with rates other than this section.

The Acting Chair: Order. We were discussing subsection 1(3) of the bill. Are there any further remarks?

Mr Philip: I am sorry, yes. Subsection 1(3) deals with rates and that is what we were discussing. Both the member for Welland-Thorold and myself were asking the parliamentary assistant to the minister, who was going to save, if anybody, and who was going to be raised? Since the minister in his various excursions, in which he went to places like Windsor the day before our hearings, liked to make press statements on exactly how this bill would affect the rates, we are questioning him on this section, which I believe is paragraph 1(3)56a.

Mr Ferraro: I will endeavour to satisfy that concern. Dealing with the greater Toronto-Hamilton-Wentworth area, I am talking about a percentage change in premium first of all. I beg your indulgence, Mr Chairman. There is a lot of information here and I am assuming the member wants me to read it:

A decrease of more than 8%, again, in the Toronto-Hamilton-Wentworth area, the number of policyholders is 5,215 and

the percentage of policyholders is 0.55. A decrease of 8% or less, there are 88,069 policyholders, the percentage of policyholders is 9.31. No change in their premiums, 6,835 policyholders, which is a percentage of policyholders of 0.72. An increase of 4% or less, there are 118,554 policyholders in the greater Toronto-Hamilton-Wentworth area, accounting for 12.53% of policyholders. An increase of more than 4%, up to and including 8%, there are 259,376 policyholders, which accounts for 27.41 on a percentage basis of total policyholders. An increase of more than 8%, up to and including 12%, 259,242 policyholders, a percentage of 27.39. An increase of more than 12%, up to and including 15%, there are 102,918 policyholders, accounting for 10.8% of all policyholders. An increase of more than 15%, there are 106,121 policyholders, the percentage of policyholders is 11.21.

Outside of the greater Toronto-Hamilton-Wentworth area: A decrease of more than 8%, 102,591, for a percentage of 8.12%. A decrease of 8% or less, 521,049 policyholders, percentage of policyholders 41.26. No change, 34,751 policyholders, again outside of the greater Toronto-Hamilton-Wentworth area, accounting for 2.75% of policyholders. An increase of 4% or less, 356,494 policyholders, 28.2%. An increase of more than 4%, up to and including 8%, 157,179 policyholders, 12.45%. An increase of more than 8%, 90,822, 7.19%.

Mr Philip: Mr Chairman, I know this question will particularly interest you, because I have added up quickly the figures that the member has given me. I did not add the decimal points because I could not write quite that quickly. According to the minister's own figures, your constituents, Mr Chairman, and mine—those in the greater Metropolitan Toronto area—over 88% of them will receive increases as a result of this legislation. Am I correct in that figure?

Mr Ferraro: I have not added them up as the member opposite has, but we stand by our overall indication that 8% is the average increase for the greater Toronto-Hamilton-Wentworth area.

The Acting Chair: The member for Welland-Thorold does not want the floor?

Mr Kormos: I defer to my good friend from Etobicoke-Rexdale.

Mr Philip: If 88% of my constituents and those of the chairman, who comes from Yorkview riding, are going to receive increases as a result of this legislation, would the parliamentary assistant explain how that keeps the Premier's promise of the last election, which is that he had a specific plan to lower automobile insurance rates?

Mr Ferraro: I think it is very clear that while we stand by our indication that in the greater Toronto-Hamilton-Wentworth area there will be average increases of 8%—we stand by that—if the Premier had not shown the direction that he did, they would be experiencing, on average, somewhere between 29% and 44% increases.

Mr Kormos: In view of the premium increases—even the ones the parliamentary assistant speaks of—and in view of the reduced compensation paid out, what will the profits be for the auto insurance industry? What are they projected to be for the fiscal year commencing with the government's implementation of Bill 68?

Mr Ferraro: I do not agree with the premise as indicated by the member in his question, and I do not have those figures.

Mr Kormos: The definition of "rate" also talks about commissions. What types of commissions are people paying now on regular automobile insurance coverage?

Mr Ferraro: I can answer it very generally in that it is my understanding, and I stand to be corrected, that insurance commissions payable to brokers are in the 12% range.

Mr Kormos: Is that commission universal with all brokers and all insurers in Ontario as it stands now?

Mr Ferraro: It is my understanding that if you are selling insurance as a representative, as a broker for an insurance company, there is a remuneration. The exact degree may vary. There may be some incentive plans, and that would be unique to the specific insurance company and the arrangement therein with the broker, but certainly if you are going to work, hopefully you get paid.

Mr Kormos: My understanding when Advocate General was permitted by this government to rip off thousands and thousands of insureds because it went belly up, notwithstanding that insurance consumers believed the government's superintendent of insurance and its Ministry of Financial Institutions were supervising these insurance companies licensed to sell insurance in Ontario, one of the things the brokers persisted in telling me was that they could not waive a commission, that indeed they were required to charge full commission on every insurance package that they sold. Can the parliamentary assistant confirm that?

Mr Ferraro: I cannot confirm or deny that.

Mr Kormos: I wonder if the parliamentary assistant could explain why commissions paid to brokers in British Columbia are significantly less than the 12% level that is proposed here in Ontario.

Mr Ferraro: I cannot explain that either.

Mr Kormos: I am wondering if the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions could tell us whether this government has any intentions of reducing the amount of commissions chargeable by brokers to insurance customers.

Mr Ferraro: The main concern of the government is to reduce the escalation of premium increases for the 6.2 million insureds, and we fully intend to do so with the passage of this bill.

Mr Kormos: I am wondering if the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions could tell us whether or not this government is considering reducing the amount of commission made payable to insurance brokers.

Mr Ferraro: Not at this time.

Mr Kormos: Why was that not investigated as one of the many means that this government says it looked at to reduce the cost of insurance to the consumer, in view of the fact that brokers in other jurisdictions, particularly in those jurisdictions which sell affordable and fairly available public, driver-owned, non-profit auto insurance, charge significantly lower brokerage commissions than are being charged right here in Ontario? Why would the government not consider that as one of the options in reducing the cost to consumers?

Mr Ferraro: Unlike the member opposite, this party is not specifically concerned about limiting the amount of remuneration that the approximately 7,000 brokers in Ontario get paid. In reference to his analogy with BC, the point I think he is trying to make is that BC has a government-run plan, a more socialist

plan in that regard, and that indeed there is no shopping around, there is no competition and subsequently there are variances not only in ideology but indeed in costing of the product per se.

1700

Mr Kormos: Interestingly, the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions is sort of right. It is a public-owned system, just as the system that the Liberals run in the province of Quebec is a public-owned system. I am wondering if the parliamentary assistant could tell us what the total amount of commissions were in the year 1989 here in Ontario. How many millions of dollars were paid out by drivers in commissions alone?

Mr Ferraro: I do not have that specific figure, but I will endeavour to obtain the same for the member.

The Acting Chair: I must remind the House again that we are dealing with the definition of "rate" under Bill 68.

Mr Kormos: I am wondering if the parliamentary assistant could tell us, in view of the fact that premiums are going to go up in this province after this Bill 68 becomes law if the Liberals are permitted to ram it through, what the increased amount of commissions will be paid, in view of the fact that premiums themselves are going to go up and in view of the fact that this government has no intention of controlling the exorbitant amount of commissions payable by insureds.

Mr Ferraro: Again, I do not agree with much of what the member opposite has said, and I do not have those specific figures.

Mr Philip: With regard to the area of commissions, indeed a number of brokers have called me and said that, with the bureaucracy of this bill, probably no amount that they are paid would make up for the problems they are going to have with this legislation.

But my question to the parliamentary assistant is this: A number of brokers have been cut off of their commissions and indeed cut off of their livelihood by companies who arbitrarily decide that for whatever reason they are no longer going to allow that particular broker to sell their insurance. This happened in one case in my own riding where a woman had built up a very good business that started off in the basement of her home. She had the misfortune of writing three people who happened to have major accidents—it could happen to anybody; it is the draw of the cards that she happened to pull three cards that were expensive cards to the insurance companies—and her business was arbitrarily cut off by the insurance company.

Am I correct—perhaps I missed it somewhere in here; I have read the bill several times—is it true that in this huge bureaucracy this government is setting up there will be nothing to protect the arbitrary decisions against brokers by insurance companies which wish to act against those brokers in an arbitrary and unreasonable manner? Is that correct?

Mr Ferraro: I find it not unusual but surprising that a number of brokers have indicated their concern specifically, and I am sure there are some because I have heard some specifically. But I can say without hesitation that most brokers, and indeed the Insurance Brokers Association of Ontario, are very excited and supportive of Bill 68, as is the Consumers' Association of Canada.

To deal with the second part of the question, I think what the member is saying is exactly what this bill is going to deal with. Insurance companies are not lily white, as we all know, and indeed there have been some arbitrary actions, if you will,

on the part of insurance companies. They have mistreated not only brokers but, in particular, many of the insureds in the province of Ontario, and it is precisely for that reason that Bill 68 will set up a very, very strong watchdog insurance agency to deal with the arbitrary aspect that has previously existed.

As to whether or not the insurance commission will be dealing with the relationship between a particular insurance company and a broker, I believe that is in its mandate to consider that, although initially I think there would be a reluctance to some degree—and I just say that on a personal basis—for the insurance commissioner to interfere with an employee-employer relationship, in essence.

Mr Philip: It is not an employee-employer relationship. These are independent business people who are at the mercy of the large insurance companies, particularly if they are small brokers. I asked the minister—I gather that the minister's answer was yes. There is nothing in this huge bureaucracy he is setting up—

An hon member: He is not the minister.

Mr Philip: The parliamentary assistant to the minister. There is nothing in this huge, expensive bureaucracy he is setting up that would in fact arbitrate in those instances where an insurance company decided that it wanted to control, if you want, the market out there and simply arbitrarily tell a broker that that broker would no longer be allowed to sell the product that his or her livelihood was dependent on for so many years. Is that correct; the answer is yes?

Mr Ferraro: The specific duties of the superintendent of insurance, the insurance commissioner and his office, are inclined towards the consumer and the insurance company. There is a process in existence now whereby the Insurance Brokers Association of Ontario has membership on a committee with the Insurance Bureau of Canada whereby there can be arbitration on specific client-insurance company relationships, if I can use that terminology, when an independent broker is experiencing some difficulty with an insurance company per se. That process seemed to be working very well in the past—perhaps not in all cases, but to be more specific, the intent of the insurance commission is not to interfere with what I term an employer-employee relationship.

Mr Philip: The parliamentary assistant is indicating that this is not a consumer issue, the relationship between the broker and the insurance company. But surely the relationship that I have as a consumer with my broker, whom I trust and to whom I give not only my automobile insurance but probably my house and a few other things—is it not a consumer issue if that broker has his business arbitrarily removed by the insurance company? That is a consumer issue; it is a consumer issue to me and to everyone else who is dealing with that broker. Would the parliamentary assistant to the minister not agree that is a consumer issue?

Mr Ferraro: I would say to the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale that the main consumer issue this bill addresses is the relationship between insurance companies and the 6.2 million insureds. I will grant the member opposite that if there is a particular broker who is experiencing some difficulty with an insurance company, perhaps the consumers served by that broker are indirectly, if not directly, affected by that relationship. I can only say that the primary purpose of the commission is not to deal with that specific problem; there is a process in place that seems to be working well in most cases, albeit not to the satisfaction perhaps of that member's particular constituent.

Mr Philip: The parliamentary assistant says there is a process in place. Can the parliamentary assistant tell us exactly what, under the present act or under the new act once it is passed, the superintendent can do in the case where an insurance company says to a broker who has built up a business, who has built up the confidence of a number of consumers: "I am sorry, you're no longer going to sell insurance for my company and therefore you're out of business. Your business has gone kaput, you can go and cancel your lease. The only thing that you're going to get for this business that you've spent 20, 30 years developing is whatever you can get for the customer list, if you're able to sell it to another broker"? Can he tell us exactly what the superintendent of insurance will be able to do under this act or under the present act, since he says it seems to be working okay, to protect that person, since we know of brokers who have literally had their businesses completely pulled from under them by the arbitrary actions of an insurance company?

1710

Mr Ferraro: I am not sure I am going to satisfy the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale. Just to reiterate, and I apologize for being repetitive, the intent of Bill 68 is to deal with the relationships specifically between the 6.2 million insureds and the insurance companies to make sure that insurance companies do not rip off, if I can use that vocabulary, the insureds, and that indeed there is a system in place whereby the drivers of Ontario will be treated fairly, equitably and quickly.

The process that, up until now, I have been led to believe, certainly in the ministry, has worked well, has been in situations where a broker has a problem with an insurance company—I acknowledge, perhaps not in all cases—is the process whereby the Insurance Brokers Association of Ontario and the Insurance Bureau of Canada—essentially the insurance companies—have a system of arbitration wherein those matters are dealt with and, up until today, I thought fairly well.

The Acting Chair: Do we have anybody else interested in speaking on subsection 1(3)? Anyone else interested in speaking on any other subsections of section 1?

Mr Philip: I am.

The Acting Chair: What section, please?

Mr Philip: I want to deal with the superintendent of insurance section and that is—

The Acting Chair: Order. So we are on subsection 1(5). Can I take it that we have handled everything up to subsection 4?

Mr Philip: Mr Chairman, you were not in the chair when the decision was made that we would take it as a whole so we can ask questions—

The Acting Chair: Order. All I am talking about is in terms of maintaining an orderly discussion. If you are satisfied with subsections 3 and 4, we are now discussing subsection 5, not that we are voting on it yet.

Mr Philip: I am not going to make a decision for other members who may wish to ask other questions on previous subsections. All that I am asking about is the powers of the superintendent of insurance, who is appointed under this—

The Acting Chair: Order. Are there any members wishing to speak to subsection 1(4)? All right, no members. We are now on subsection 1(5). The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale.

Mr Philip: Perhaps it is under subsection 4 or it may be under subsection 5, depending on where the regulations stem from. Would the parliamentary assistant tell us exactly how many regulations are contemplated that would be, of course, probably designed by the superintendent and recommended to the minister, but that would be passed by orders in council? Are there regulations that have now been drafted? How many of them are there? What sections do they pertain to and are they ready for examination?

Mr Ferraro: I would ask the indulgence of the member opposite to clarify for my benefit. Is he talking about the regulations accompanying the statute that have already been drafted and he wants to know specifically how many?

Mr Philip: This is important legislation. One of the arguments that was made by the Liberals in opposition was that we should not be passing legislation without having a knowledge of the regulations. Now, considerable powers have been given to the minister and to the superintendent of insurance whom he is appointing under this section. I would simply like to know what areas he plans on dealing with under the regulatory system, because we do not have the regulations before us now, so that we can have some idea of exactly what is being done in terms of the regulations.

Mr Ferraro: The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale will acknowledge that indeed there was a circulation of regulations dealing specifically with the no-fault benefit section which were made public, and that indeed, admittedly, the entire regulations will be forthcoming as quickly as they are developed, assuming that the bill passes, and with what specific amendments.

Mr Philip: Mr Chairman, you will be aware that on numerous occasions I have advocated that regulations have a sunset clause put in them and that indeed that complicated legislation should have a sunset clause put in it so that there would be an automatic review to find out exactly whether or not the legislation and the regulations are meeting objectives. Can the parliamentary assistant tell us whether or not any of the regulations will have any sunset clause put into them and whether they will be reviewed by a committee of the Legislature in addition to a review by the cabinet? Can he tell us where the sunset clause is in this whole legislative process for this bill, since obviously he would want an evaluation of it once it were in place for at least a couple of years?

Mr Ferraro: I share many of the concerns expressed by the member opposite and I think he raises a good point. There is, in fact, a sunset regulation of sorts in an amendment form whereby the minister has to, every two years, report to the House, essentially on the regulatory appropriateness and how it is working, quite frankly. Indeed, as the member opposite knows, as he has been the chairman of the standing committee on public accounts, it is the purview of the House that that committee, if it deems it so advisable, call before it the superintendent of insurance, the insurance commissioner, and ask any and all questions possible.

The short answer is that regulatory supervision is an essential part of the bill in amendment form. The minister is compelled to report to the House on a two-year basis.

Mr Philip: Am I correct in saying that unless the government decides to schedule that report which the minister would table, it would not be debated in the House? Is that correct?

Mr Ferraro: The short answer to that would be that if the minister makes a statement to the House, there would not be a prolonged debate *per se*. There would be, however, the option, and I reiterate, for the all-party committee of the House—in particular, I guess, the public accounts committee, of which the member opposite is the chairman—to deal with it in that form.

Mr Philip: The parliamentary assistant to the minister seems to be getting confused between statements by the ministry and reports by the ministry. He says there would be an opportunity to debate a statement by the ministry. I assume the parliamentary assistant meant a report by the ministry. The minister, he says, under his amendment will have to table a report in the House every two years. Is that correct? If it is correct, would he not agree that it is up to the government to schedule the debate of that report and that in fact most reports that are tabled in this House never get debated, particularly in majority governments, when the government does not see fit that it wishes a report debated?

Mr Ferraro: Perhaps in my enunciation I did confuse the member opposite, but I acknowledge full well that there would be a tabling of a report—and I would be happy to read the amendment if the member so desires—on a two-year basis. Indeed, in all probability the minister, as is the custom in the House, will make a statement in relation to that report. Indeed, as is the custom and the tradition of this House, there is essentially a five-minute response on the statement. But as I say, the public accounts committee, or any other committee for that matter, may wish to deal with the report specifically and in so doing request that not only the superintendent of insurance, the insurance commissioner, but indeed the minister or the deputy minister, appear before the committee.

Mr Philip: So what the parliamentary assistant to the minister is saying is that with this important legislation, which is going to cost the taxpayers so much, the opposition will actually have an opportunity to make a statement on it of a maximum of five minutes each when the makes a statement that he is tabling a report in the House.

Is that what the parliamentary assistant sees as being the ongoing review that is necessary or, indeed, the concept of sunset, which is that when you have important legislation, particularly legislation like this that is in my opinion squandering, but in his opinion, at least, admittedly spending millions and millions of taxpayers dollars; that there is absolutely no review process built in to have us review this; to have a value-for-money look at this and, indeed, hopefully to amend this or abolish it as the case may be? Is that not what the parliamentary assistant is saying?

1720

Mr Ferraro: Again, I am not going to change the mind of the member opposite. Let me just say it is my understanding that many, many reports about many contentious and serious issues dealing with the people of Ontario are filed almost on a weekly basis in this House. And many committees will deal with those reports specifically and in public at the call of that committee and it is no different in this regard.

I might add as well, that unique in this legislation—in fact uniqueness is the fact that there is a reporting on a biannual time frame, but unique, as well, is the fact that there is a no-fault benefits committee. There is an advisory committee to the ministry, to the commission and the commissioner, comprised of just about every spectrum of society—the handicapped, the insurance companies, hopefully the legal aspect, the social

workers, the physiotherapists and so forth—that will advise the insurance commissioner and the ministry on an ongoing basis of the need for change and suggestions dealing with the regulatory structure of the insurance bill in conjunction with, as I said, the sunset provision on a biannual basis.

Mr Philip: If there are all of these groups that you are going to appoint as representatives, to have committees to look at these things, reporting to the ministry, would it not make some sense to have a sunset clause in this bill so that Parliament could review it in two years' time and decide exactly how effective it was?

Now, this government has built in a sunset clause in legislation that has stopped developers from plowing under usable, livable, rental accommodation. They put in a sunset clause in that that said that after two years, unless the government brings it back and it is passed, it would self-destruct and the developers could get their bulldozers out and plow down people's homes. Now, if you could put in a sunset clause to plow under people's homes, people's apartments that they have lived in for so many years, then why can you not at least have a sunset clause here so that we could find out exactly whether or not the consumer is being well served by Bill 68 in a couple of years' time?

Mr Ferraro: I would, in response, say that in the government's view there is a sunset clause which is unique, in relative terms, to most of the legislation that is passed on a two-year basis. I guess where I would differ from the member opposite is that when a report is filed, usually accompanied by a short statement by the minister, that is an opportunity for the House to review that report. To suggest that there is not an opportunity for the members of this House to deal with that report, in my view, is not totally correct. I will acknowledge, however, that unless the House leaders decide, that report will not be debated at length. However, as has been the tradition, there is an ample opportunity in other venues wherein that report can be debated.

Mr Wildman: It seems to me that we are getting involved in some semantics here. It seems to me that the parliamentary assistant is not really talking about a sunset clause. What he is really talking about is more like a Venetian-blind clause. The fact is a sunset clause, as I understand it, basically says that an agency will operate for a particular length of time and at the end of that time it no longer continues to operate, unless the House, in its wisdom, reactivates or continues the operation of that agency.

In this case, the parliamentary assistant is referring to sunset, but what he is really talking about is a ministerial report to the House, which in fact is not a sunset clause, but rather a very limited chance for a couple of members of the House to respond to a ministerial statement. He does acknowledge it is possible the report might be debated in the House at greater length if the House leaders of the various parties agreed to schedule it for debate. That is true of all reports. For that matter, Mr Chair, I am sure you would agree, particularly in a majority government situation, that the House is essentially at the mercy of the decision of the government House leader and the majority. If the majority in the House wishes a report to be debated, it will be debated; if the majority does not wish it to be debated, it will not be debated.

It is true there are provisions in the rules for members of the minority to refer reports out to committees and the committee could then carry out an investigation on the basis of a report. In the new rules there is the provision, as I understand it—it is a

rule that has only been used two or three times—that members of the opposition in committees can in fact decide that a particular issue should be discussed, and they can reserve 12 hours for debate.

So there is that option available. But if there is really to be an ongoing review and a real analysis of the success or failure of the agency, what is required is a longer review than 12 hours, and that, again, is subject to the will of the majority on the committee which, in essence, goes back to the government House leader. I know the House leaders like to maintain the myth in this House that they do not, in fact, direct committees and direct committees' work, but we all know that if the government House leader is diametrically opposed to a committee going off in some direction that he or she does not wish, it seems somehow to filter down to the government members on the committee. The government members tend, in most cases—not always, but in most cases—to comply with the wishes of the government House leader.

So what we have here is not a sunset clause at all but, as I said, sort of a Venetian-blind clause where the blind will be raised and there will be a ray of sunlight on the agency for up to maybe 15 minutes in the House. Unless the government House leader is prepared to pull that blind all the way up and to have a real review, the blind will come down again and the agency will continue to operate until, two years later, there is another report and that blind is raised a little again.

Mr Ferraro: Having been a proud member of the majority, and having been in the House for the last several months and weeks and been entertained by the debate dealing with Bill 68, it is difficult for me, as a member of that majority, to say who in fact was at whose mercy. I will acknowledge that maybe there is a distinction between definitions of "sunset," but I say to the member opposite that notwithstanding the fact that I agree with much of what he said, the reality is that when you are dealing specifically with this bill and with a major piece of legislation, which this bill is, if indeed the report is filed and there were some things in that report that are distasteful to the opposition, notwithstanding the access they have to members' statements, getting the House leaders on side, calling it before a committee or press conferences, I am sure the loyal members of the opposition will make a point of bringing the matter to the attention of the people of Ontario.

1730

Mr Wildman: Very briefly, I want to acknowledge the fact that the parliamentary assistant has inferred, at least, that majority government does not work.

Mr Philip: What we are doing is we are spending a lot of money here—

Interjection.

Mr Philip: Well, I am sorry. If preventing legislation from passing quickly which is going to transfer \$1 billion from the pockets of ordinary people to the pockets of the insurance company is a waste of time to the Liberal members, then that is the kind of waste of time my constituents want. They are quite happy for the waste of time that we are causing at the moment, if that is what the member wants to label it. If asking questions as to the cost of this huge bureaucracy is a waste of time, then I think those are the kinds of questions that the taxpayers want before we rubber-stamp or pass any kind of legislation.

My question to the parliamentary assistant—since I do not have an opportunity to ask it of the minister, who hid from both

the committee and the House—is, if on this important legislation, which is spending so much money creating such a bureaucracy, it is not important enough for the government to have a sunset clause in it so that it would be forced to justify the legislation again two years' or three years' time, as it has done with other pieces of legislation, why is it that it would not at least put into it a requirement that there be a value-for-money audit on this legislation to find out whether or not the consumer is getting value for money in this huge bureaucracy that it is setting up?

Mr Ferraro: I would, without question, disagree with a lot of what the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale has said. Suffice it to say that it is the purview of the Provincial Auditor now that, if indeed, as is his right, he feels that there is some impropriety or, indeed, that the particular agency in question, in this case the Ontario Insurance Commission, should be looked at with a forensic audit or whatever, then of course he has that right to do so and should.

It is perfectly acknowledged, if you will, that, notwithstanding the fact there might not be a specific sunset clause in this piece of legislation, indeed, reporting on a biannual basis to some degree is a form of sunset.

I say in conclusion, the accountability for every piece of legislation that is passed, particularly given the honour of a majority government, goes without saying.

Mr Philip: The parliamentary assistant to the minister refers to the fact that the auditor can conduct a forensic audit. Now, maybe that is an admission that he considers there is something illegal about stealing \$1 billion from the taxpayers of Ontario and transferring it to the insurance companies. But, under the strict definition of this, this would not fall under what I would call or what the Provincial Auditor would call a "forensic matter." In order for something to be a forensic matter, you actually have to have proof that the guy's hand is in your pocket and that he took out the money and transferred to his own pocket.

I think perhaps the parliamentary assistant to the minister has a more poetic definition, perhaps more correct in the sense of this bill, than indeed would be acceptable to our Provincial Auditor, who tends to be a very straightforward sort of fellow.

In order to do a value-for-money audit, surely there have to be some fairly clear definitions and objectives as set out by the ministry, and there are no objectives set out by the ministry in this bill. There are no clear objectives in terms of statements by the ministry as to how much specifically it intends to save the taxpayer or the consumer as a result of this legislation and, therefore, nothing that the auditor could measure it by. All that the auditor can do is find out whether or not the commissions are operating in the way set out by this statute, and that is all.

I ask the parliamentary assistant why he would not, at least as part of his ministry, set out specific goals for this legislation and then commit himself to a value-for-money audit. Why would he not do that, or would he do that and would he commit himself to tabling a value-for-money audit within two years of this legislation being passed?

Mr Ferraro: I am not in a position to commit the government, or certainly the ministry, to do that. Suffice it to say that we think we have indeed dealt with a very serious situation from the standpoint of it affecting 6.2 million drivers, if not the whole province. To have the degree of specificity that is requested by the member opposite would be almost impossible, and I think he would have to acknowledge that.

I can say that the intent of the government in dealing with the insurance crisis in Ontario in a comprehensive way is to provide affordable insurance rates for the people of Ontario, and we are doing that: on average 8% in the greater Toronto-Hamilton-Wentworth area and 0% elsewhere. Failure to do so in this regard would result in minimum increases, on average, for everyone of 30%. So in dealing with a mammoth undertaking, the degree of specifics as requested by the member are just not possible or logical.

Mr Philip: The parliamentary assistant's usual line is that he cannot commit himself for the ministry. If he cannot, why is the minister not here then to make a commitment and answer our questions? The PA's response six weeks ago, and indeed further back, was that he could not provide the answer to our questions. Today he cannot provide the answers to our questions.

If this legislation is designed to protect the consumer, would the parliamentary assistant at least then go back to his boss, the minister who hides from the committee and hides from the House, and ask the minister to give him this answer by Wednesday when the bill is dealt with next? Will the minister, before this bill is passed, set out a clear set of objectives and commit himself to a value-for-money audit within two years to see whether or not those objectives are being met? And will that value-for-money audit be made public so that all of us may be able to see what this bill accomplishes instead of making statements, as the minister did, running around the province a day ahead of the committee and making outlandish statements which this poor parliamentary assistant cannot justify and cannot even comment on?

Mr Ferraro: In response, I may not be able to justify it in the mind of the member opposite, and I understand that, but as far as commenting, I am perfectly capable of doing that. I just say to the member opposite, if he only knew how I had to beg with the minister for me to have this opportunity, and I am thankful to the honourable minister for affording me this luxury and an opportunity to earn my \$9,000.

I think it would be somewhat wrong for me to confuse the member. The government feels the accountability is in place. We feel that there is a sunset provision of sorts, unlike in most pieces of legislation that have passed in recent times, that indeed we feel that the accountability is there, and notwithstanding the outcome of any election forthcoming, no doubt members of the loyal opposition will see to it that that accountability is prevalent.

Mr Philip: I will certainly point out the parliamentary assistant's earlier figure that 80% of the people of the greater Metropolitan Toronto area, as a result of this, can expect their automobile insurance to increase.

1740

Mr Kormos: I want to ask the parliamentary assistant what the rate-setting mechanism powers of the commission are.

Mr Ferraro: The commission, under the management of the commissioner, has the most extensive powers that we feel exist in Canada. In the present situation, they are totally inadequate. The commission and the commissioner will have the power, upon filings by the insurance companies, to accept or reject any of the filings and any proposed increases, if indeed, in his opinion, they are unjustifiable.

Mr Kormos: What criteria will the commission use to determine the appropriateness of rates filed?

Mr Ferraro: The commission and the commissioner will make that determination essentially on the basis of what is just and reasonable, according to their non-partisan and unbiased view.

Mr Kormos: Mr Chairman, this member for Guelph knows better than that. What is this cheap bit of pettifoggery coming from him now? What criteria are that commission empowered to use to determine what is just and reasonable? Come on, smarten up.

The Second Deputy Chair: Does that require a response?

Mr Ferraro: I will acknowledge one thing. If I am so smart, why am I here? Suffice it to say that I am not sure I am going to make the member for Welland-Thorold happy. In our view, "just and reasonable" is as broad and as all-encompassing a parameter for the insurance commission and commissioner, and indeed gives them the flexibility to make a determination in that regard.

Mr Kormos: Does that mean there will be no definition of what constitutes "just and reasonable" for the guidance of the commission?

Mr Ferraro: For the benefit of the member for Welland-Thorold, let me quote specifically from the bill:

"369(11) The commissioner shall refuse to approve an application respecting proposed classes of risk exposure that the commissioner considers,

"(a) are not reasonably predictive of risk; or

"(b) do not distinguish fairly between classes of risk exposure.

"(12) The commissioner shall refuse to approve an application respecting proposed rates that the commissioner considers would impair the solvency of the applicant or are excessive in relation to the financial circumstances of the insurer."

And on and on and on, Mr Chairman, again within the context of what is deemed just and reasonable, and I think that is just and reasonable.

Mr Kormos: What consideration is this commission going to be required to make of affordability?

Mr Ferraro: Dealing specifically with the rates and what is affordable, it will make that determination on the basis of the economic situation of the day, the automobile insurance industry per se and indeed, what is just, reasonable and acceptable to the people of Ontario.

Mr Kormos: What consideration is the commission empowered to make of an inefficient insurance company that spends too much on overhead?

Mr Ferraro: The powers of the commission and the commissioner are significantly enhanced to the degree that, once the rate filings are in, if that determination—to use the specific analogy or situation of the member for Welland-Thorold—is not acceptable, they will not approve any rate increase.

Mr Kormos: This government some time ago promised an insurance advocate to appear on behalf of consumers at a similar type of board. How come there is no insurance advocate included as a part of this package?

Mr Ferraro: It is the intent of this legislation in essence to make the insurance commission the advocate for the people of Ontario and the employees therein. If there is a problem, if there is a concern on the part of the insurers in Ontario, then indeed not only do they have access to their MPPs but specifically

there will be a telephone line available for them to contact the commission directly.

Mr Philip: I wonder if the parliamentary assistant would explain to this House how the superintendent can be in both a judicial position and an advocacy position at the same time. Any jurisdiction that has set up any quasi-judicial bodies, be it the Ombudsman or any other body, has clearly distinguished between the advocacy system and the judicial and quasi-judicial system. How can you be both an advocate and a judge at the same time?

Mr Ferraro: It is very simple. In the context of being an overseer, if you will, of the auto insurance industry in Ontario, they have in regulation certain rights and certain powers to deal with wrongdoings on the part of insurance companies to the insureds in Ontario. If indeed a consumer has a problem dealing with an insurance matter, that individual merely has to contact the commission and someone in the commission's office will address that. If not, the commissioner pursuing will address that problem specifically and no doubt quickly.

Mr Philip: This is the same kind of fuzzymindedness that has created problems at the Ontario Human Rights Commission. When there is no clear distinction between the role of an advocate and the role of the Ombudsman or arbitrator even, then you end up with problems.

Where is the equality between the poor little guy who has a grade 6 education and his insurance has gone up in an arbitrary manner, and the large insurance companies with their accountants, their lawyers and their resources? If you are going to make a judicial decision based on information provided by this poor guy whose insurance has gone up and the insurance companies with all of their accountants, where is the equality for the person who has to make the decision in a quasi-judicial function?

Mr Ferraro: I think the situation that will exist subsequent to the passage of Bill 68 will ensure, perhaps as never before, the equality and the logic of dealing with the problem on the part of the consumer. The reality of the situation is that the commission is there to oversee the auto insurance business in Ontario, specifically the insurance companies. If indeed they are mistreating the consumer from the standpoint of either their practices or the amount of premiums that they want to charge, then indeed they will be dealt with by the commissioner.

Quite frankly, I think the beauty of the system is that if a consumer has a problem, he will not only have the problem investigated by the commission but the commission will be the enforcer in order to rectify that, as opposed to having an advocate who then has to go to a quasi-judicial agency. In order to make sure that the concerns are dealt with, you have a one-stop house of remedy, for lack of a better word.

Mr Kormos: What rubbish. Why is it then that this Minister of Financial Institutions and his parliamentary assistant have kept secret the rate filings of insurance companies? How can consumers protect themselves when the government will keep secret the rates that the insurance companies propose to charge them? How can that be?

Mr Ferraro: I beg to differ. We do not keep the rate filings secret. The reality of the situation is that not all the rate filings when originally requested were in. Indeed, when the concern was expressed by the member opposite and by the member for Leeds-Grenville, they requested not only the rate filings but the actuarial reports and studies. They requested 24 and this government released 39, which is unprecedented.

I would say with the utmost respect to the members opposite that they got more information and specifics dealing with this bill than ever before in the history of the province, from any government.

1750

Mr Kormos: Let's have those rate filings right now, because if we are going to talk about rates, let's talk about real rates. Let's talk about the real rates that the insurance industry is going to charge drivers in this province, instead of the government's gobbledegook. Why does the government not file the rates with this committee of the whole right now?

Mr Ferraro: The member will know and acknowledge, I am sure, that a rate summary was filed, that indeed at this point in time the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board and the interim insurance commissioner are dealing with some of the rate filings, as I understand it, and that there is no intent whatsoever to hide anything, notwithstanding the opinion and innuendo that the member opposite might want to project.

Mr Philip: If the parliamentary assistant says there is no intent to hide them, why does he not give them to us today? If we are passing legislation, we want to know exactly what the effect is. Let's have the rates now. Why can we not have them now? Are they not available now?

Mr Ferraro: As the member has heard before—and whether he wants to accept it or not, it is factual—many of the parts of the rate filings are sensitive from the standpoint of each individual insurance company. I know the member opposite, notwithstanding his socialist tendencies, will acknowledge that in the free-enterprise system, in the competitive system, there are and have to be some confidential aspects, in particular dealing with rate filings. To suggest that the volumes of material that are presently being looked at by the OAIB and the interim insurance commissioner be released to me would be not only impractical but unfair.

Mr Philip: I think the only thing that is unfair is that the taxpayer and the consumer do not know exactly what they are getting in this legislation. That is what is really unfair.

My question to the parliamentary assistant is this. As my colleague the member for Hamilton Mountain has pointed out several times in this House, the Liberals in opposition, vis-à-vis energy prices, advocated the idea of a consumer advocate. The reason the Liberals in opposition advocated that was that they made the argument that faced with the tremendous power, research capabilities and public relations capabilities of Ontario Hydro and Consumers' Gas, the average consumer, even a very competent body like the Consumers' Association of Canada, Ontario division, did not have the full resources to make a proper presentation and get at the information needed to have an equal balance with Hydro on the other side, with its public relations people, with its economists, its researchers and so forth.

If that argument could be made and if they could promise, in opposition before an election, a consumer advocate for something like energy, which the Liberals have not kept, surely it would make sense to have a consumer advocate for something as complicated as automobile insurance. With all the actuarial tables, which the parliamentary assistant says are voluminous and presently being studied by the commissioner of insurance, surely it would make some sense to have a balance on the other side; a balance, namely, of a consumer advocate, in the same way that the government has appointed, in the case of workers' compensation, advocates for injured workers. Why would the

Liberals not carry through the principle in terms of the consumer, both for energy, which is another election promise they have broken, and for this, which would seem to be a reasonable request?

Mr Ferraro: I think we are going to agree to disagree on this matter. I think the government's position makes all the sense in the world. We have established an insurance commission with an increase in staffing of 50 people. When one takes into consideration what presently exists in the OAIB and the department of the superintendent of insurance now, indeed they are advocates and watchdogs for the consumers and over the insurance industry, to make sure there is this feeling of equitableness, for lack of a better word, in the auto insurance industry in Ontario.

I find it somewhat contradictory that the member opposite has on several occasions made a particular request for audits and indeed now his particular request is for a separate entity to offset the insurance companies to act as an advocate, thereby increasing the bureaucracy and increasing the costs involved in the administration of the auto insurance commission in Ontario, which is significantly and directly contrary to some of the arguments he was making earlier.

Mr Kormos: The government promised an insurance advocate and then broke that promise. The parliamentary assistant knows that it promised one and he knows that it broke its promise. Why did it do that?

Mr Ferraro: We are going to disagree again. Instead of one insurance advocate, we have provided an entire insurance commission which acts as an advocate for the 6.2 million drivers in Ontario.

Mr Kormos: Is the parliamentary assistant denying that the member for Wilson Heights, the minister of the day, promised an insurance advocate in 1987?

Mr Ferraro: I am saying that the drivers in Ontario will have all the advocacy that they need in the present context as proposed in Bill 68.

Mr Kormos: And similarly broke that promise. Is this government going to call upon its insurance commission to establish across-the-board discounts for senior citizens?

Mr Ferraro: I can say that with the passage of Bill 68 the vast majority of the 6.2 million people will be getting a discount, as opposed to not passing Bill 68, in which case the vast majority, if not all of them, will be experiencing at least 30% increases.

Mr Kormos: I asked a question. I asked whether this government was going to call upon its insurance commission to establish an across-the-board discount for senior citizens.

Mr Ferraro: I say to the member for Welland-Thorold that we are anxiously awaiting the reaction, in particular, of the seniors who drive in Ontario, and we know they will be happy.

Mr Kormos: Let me tell the parliamentary assistant this: In British Columbia, in a non-profit, driver-owned system, senior citizens get discounts. Seniors deserve discounts, and it is shameful that this government will not even consider calling upon its commission to establish across-the-board discounts. Is this government going to call upon its commission to establish uniformity of surcharges for offences?

Mr Ferraro: We have looked at situations in insurance in other provinces, in other states, and we are looking with anticipation not only to the passage of this bill but, more impor-

tant, to the reaction that will be experienced throughout the province by the drivers. In fact, it is somewhat confusing; if this bill is as bad as the opposition members say it is, they should be looking forward with anticipation to the passage as well because, of course, if there is dissatisfaction, it should show up come election time. That is a challenge and an experience that we accept readily.

Mr Kormos: We are. We are not so cruel as to want to sell out victims and senior citizens and drivers and taxpayers for the interests of the insurance companies like these clowns are. Why is it that in British Columbia senior citizens are granted 25% discounts, and this government will not even consider calling upon its commission to provide similar discounts to seniors, people over 65, here in Ontario? Why will this government not call upon its commission to provide across-the-board discounts for seniors? Does this government not think seniors deserve that much?

Mr Ferraro: Seniors deserve that much and more, and we are perfectly happy and excited about the aspect, and how our seniors and all insureds in Ontario are going to be treated, so much so that we think our system is better than British Columbia's.

Mr Kormos: What risk classification is this government going to permit for insurance companies here in Ontario?

Mr Ferraro: That is a determination that will be made essentially by the Ontario Insurance Commission, at least initially. If the member is asking me if there will be a standardized system of rate classification, the only thing I can say in response is that we are not contemplating at this time standardizing a classification system. It may eventually come to that, but at this point in time there is enough of a change in the insurance business, the way we do business. It is a significant and dramatic change, so much so that we think the whole atmosphere deserves a little time in order to adjust.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order, please. The honourable member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, following the standing orders, has brought forward to the committee of the whole House, it now being the termination of—

Mr Philip: I believe I have 30 seconds.

The Second Deputy Chair: Thirty seconds, okay.

Mr Philip: I have 30 seconds. If there is not going to be any standard rate classification system established, how can the government guarantee any kind of fairness in this system? Why set up the tribunal, at tremendous cost to the taxpayers, in the first place if it is not going to have any built-in system to guarantee fairness?

Mr Ferraro: We can say to the member that the equitableness and the fairness will be inherent in the fact that the rate filings of the insurance companies have to be made to the insurance commission, and indeed if there is a classification or something that is not acceptable, it will not be allowed to proceed or be passed on to the consumers. So in that regard it will be dealt with fairly and equitably.

The Second Deputy Chair: The last 30 seconds being eked out, and following the standing orders as directed by the House to the committee of the whole House, is it the pleasure of the committee that the committee rises and reports?

On motion by Mr Ferraro, the committee reported progress.

Mr Charlton: Mr Speaker, pursuant to standing order 9(c), I move that the House sit beyond 6 o'clock.

The Speaker: I do appreciate the member rising on a point of order. However, I think he understands the standing orders, and therefore that is out of order at the present time.

The House adjourned at 1800.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaître, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling
Clerk: Douglas Arnott**Estimates**

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Harold Brown**Finance and economic affairs**

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft
Clerk: Lisa Freedman**General government**

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman
Clerk: Franco Carrozza**Government agencies**

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South
Clerk: Harold Brown**Legislative Assembly**

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan
Clerk: Deborah Deller**Ombudsman**

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock
Clerk: Franco Carrozza**Public accounts**

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Regulations and private bills**

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham
Clerk: Lisa Freedman**Resources development**

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman
Clerk: Lynn Mellor**Social development**

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner
Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts
Clerk: Deborah Deller**Education**

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Energy**

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray
Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Monday 14 May 1990

Members' statements

Oshawa Generals	1163
Mr Breagh	
Visions 2020	1163
Mrs Marland	
Ken Huntington	1163
Mr Ballinger	
Pay equity	1163
Mr Farnan	
William Withrow	1164
Mr Wiseman	
Carabram	1164
Mr Callahan	
Student safety	1164
Mr R. F. Johnston	
National Tourism Week	1164
Mr McLean	
Michael Smith	1165
Mr Miclash	

Statements by the ministry

Police Week	1165
Mr Offer	
Automotive industry	1165
Mr Kwinter	

Responses

Automotive industry	1165
Mr D. S. Cooke	
Police Week	1166
Mr Kormos	
Mr Runciman	

Oral questions

Neonatal care	1167
Mr Reville	
Mrs Caplan	
Police commission nomination	1167
Mr Kormos	
Mr R. F. Nixon	
Cardiovascular care	1168
Mrs Cunningham	
Mrs Caplan	
Mr Eves	
Environmental assessment	1169
Mrs Marland	
Mr Bradley	
Anti-drug strategies	1169
Mr Morin-Strom	
Mr Black	

Women's apprenticeship programs	1170
Mrs Cunningham	
Mr Conway	
Windsor area automotive industry	1171
Mr M. C. Ray	
Mr Kwinter	
Child care	1171
Mr Conway	
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Cancer treatment	1172
Mr Pouliot	
Mrs Caplan	
Beekeeping industry	1172
Mr Villeneuve	
Mr Ramsay	
Elevators	1172
Miss Roberts	
Mr Sorbara	
Assistance to farmers	1173
Mr Kormos	
Mr Ramsay	
Mental health workers	1173
Mr McLean	
Mrs Caplan	
Freedom of information and protection of privacy	1174
Mr Carrothers	
Mr Sorbara	
Termite control	1174
Ms Bryden	
Mr Bradley	

Motion

Private members' public business	1175
Mr Ward	
Agreed to	1175

Petitions

Blind pedestrians	1175
Mr M. C. Ray	
French-language services	1175
Mr Wiseman	
Education funding	1175
Mr D. S. Cooke	
Automobile insurance	1175
Mr Cousens	

First readings

City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr14	1175
Mr Kanter	
Agreed to	1175

Ontario Korean Businessmen's Association

Act, 1990, Bill Pr73	1175
Mr Ruprecht	
Agreed to	1175

Committee of the whole House**Insurance Statute Law Amendment Act,**

1989, Bill 68	1175
Mr D. S. Cooke	1176
Mr Pouliot	1176
Mr Eves	1176
Mr Ferraro	1176
Mr R. F. Nixon	1177
Mr Kormos	1177

Mrs Marland	1177
Mr Philip	1178
Mr Runciman	1183
Mr Wildman	1192
Mr Charlton	1196
Progress reported	1196

Other business

Adjournment	1196
------------------------------	------

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1197
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1200

CARON
x1
-D 23



33 90

33 90

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 15 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 15 mai 1990



Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 15 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

KINDERGARTEN

Mr R. F. Johnston: I would like to bring to the attention of the House and of the Minister of Education, in case he does not know about it, a large problem which is arising now in York region where parents who wish to have their children in junior kindergarten in that area are being told by their local board of education that it will not be possible, through lack of consultation between the government, which now plans to make junior kindergarten mandatory across the province, and a board which feels that its resources are being too stretched by underfunding and by the enormous growth in that area and is therefore reluctant to provide junior kindergarten.

What this means is that parents in that region are now going to be sending their children—in fact, many have already decided to—to North York in Metropolitan Toronto where there is junior kindergarten available. It is outrageous to me that children should have to be driven 40 to 50 minutes perhaps each morning to attend junior kindergarten because that is the desire of their parents, a policy of this government, and yet a board in the province of Ontario would restrict them from doing so.

Some of these parents are now going to try to switch their support, to transfer their fees to the North York board as an option to try to put pressure on the board of education in York region, but I would suggest that the pressure should be coming from the Minister of Education and from this government. If it believed that JK should be available, it should be telling that board of education to implement it and to provide the resources that are necessary from the province to make it happen.

POLICE SERVICES

Mr Pollock: As all the members know, this is Police Week and I would like to pay tribute to all the police across the province but in particular the police in the riding of Hastings-Peterborough. We have three Ontario Provincial Police detachments in the riding—Apsley, Bancroft, and Madoc—along with two local forces at Lakefield and Stirling. Part of the riding is covered by the OPP detachments from Peterborough, Campbellford and Belleville. They endeavour to apply law enforcement in these areas with success because I am sure we have one of the lowest crime rates in the province.

The police officers who visit the schools and explain the VIP program—value, influence and peers—deserve a vote of thanks for their efforts. Value means not being involved in shoplifting and vandalism. Influence means being neat in appearance so as to demand respect. Peers means peer pressure—not letting anyone influence one to take drugs or be involved in any other crime-related incidents.

Again this year the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police is sponsoring an Adopt-a-Cop program to raise money to send mentally handicapped people from communities to the Special Olympics. This is the fourth year that this torch run has been held and the first year when it is possible that every police force

in Ontario will be involved. Eight separate relays will start from every corner of Ontario and finish in Toronto at the SkyDome on Thursday 7 June. It is easy to adopt a cop by just calling one's force and saying, "Adopt-a-Cop."

VISIONS 2020

Mr Fleet: Visions 2020, Ontario's Youth—Ontario's Future. This book was recently presented to me by active and concerned students of Humberside Collegiate Institute in my riding of High Park-Swansea. In Visions 2020, Ontario students use their own words to describe their vision for Ontario in the year 2020. They also state how they intend to participate in achieving specific environmental goals. I salute the thoughtful and thought-provoking ideas of students from all over Ontario. The fact that the students feel committed to solving problems and taking necessary actions to improve our environment is particularly encouraging.

Let me highlight an excerpt from the Humberside Collegiate contribution:

"Industries and consumers must pay for a cleanup of these sites and the government of Ontario must ensure, through legislation and enforcement, that toxic dumps are never again situated within range of polluting North American water sources. No serious vision of sustainable water reserves can discount the goal of removing, destroying or recycling the contents of every toxic waste dump site within range of polluting Ontario water supplies and the Great Lakes themselves, holders of 80 per cent of North American and 20 per cent of global freshwater reserves."

I completely support the goal of cleaning up our waterways, including the Humber River system, Grenadier Pond and Lake Ontario. I look forward to working with students and others in achieving this end.

TEACHERS

Mr Farnan: The Liberal government must be concerned that the board of governors of the Ontario Teachers' Federation has decided to launch an all-affiliate, co-ordinated political action program for the next provincial election.

Teachers are no longer going to be taken for granted. Teachers—and the government should remember that there are over 120,000 teachers in Ontario—will cast their ballots in the upcoming election after careful reflection on this government's record and, believe me, the votes of teachers will make a difference. They will remember the high-handed manner in which this Liberal government totally ignored the pension concerns of teachers. They will recognize that education was given short shrift—five sentences in a 68-page budget document. Little wonder, for if inflation is taken into account, this Liberal government will be offering less money in 1993 for capital needs than it did in 1988. Far too many students spend too many years of their educational lives in portable classrooms. The government has offered no funding to back up its destreaming of full-time kindergarten programs.

In addition, this government has broken its promises to increase the provincial percentage of education funding and continues to place an unacceptably heavy burden on the backs of local taxpayers. In a nutshell, the government's record in education has been great on words but, regrettably, weak on delivery.

However, rest assured teachers will not be fooled. They see through the rhetoric and they will vote on this government's record. That is a reality that should cause some sleepless nights for Liberal members.

1340

WAYNE OLMSTED

Mr Jackson: It is indeed true that one never needs to look too far to find real heroes. The qualities of courage, bravery and self-sacrifice can be readily found in members of one's own community. Constable Wayne Olmsted was just such a hero. As a Halton police officer who served most of his 22 years of service in Burlington, Wayne was decorated with the Ontario Medal for Bravery in 1979. He risked his life to subdue a gunman who had shot a fellow officer and had then begun to shoot at innocent passersby on a Burlington street.

In the words used by Halton Police Chief James Harding, Wayne ignored acute danger in the service of his fellow man. Constable Wayne Olmsted bravely overcame the many challenges he has faced within his own life as a police officer. However, Wayne was finally himself overcome by cancer on Friday at Hamilton's St Joseph's Hospital.

He leaves his wife, Jeanette, and his two children, Katrina and Troy, to whom I extend my sincere and deepest sympathies and condolences and those of each and every member of this Legislature. We are to be reminded of Wayne's bravery, dedication and constant readiness to make the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty on behalf of the people he was sworn to protect.

On behalf of his colleagues in the Halton Regional Police and the citizens he served, I would like to dedicate the observance of Police Week in Halton to the memory of a real hero, Constable Wayne Olmsted.

AUTOMOBILE DRIVERS

Mr Tatham: Respect, consideration, wisdom, intelligence, comprehension, prudence, rational, sensible, fair, thoughtful, judicious, good judgement, long-headed, horse sense, clear thinking, clear-headed, understanding, awake, bright, responsible—all these qualities are requirements for motor vehicle drivers. I believe that the vast majority of our fellow citizens who drive have these qualities.

As you drive through Toronto in the 401 express lanes, you have the choice of three lanes. Usually the posted speed limit is 100 kilometres per hour. If you are in the centre lane and proceeding at 100 kilometres an hour and a large vehicle pulls in behind you so close that unless you notice the manufacturer's name on the grill as the vehicle pulls in behind you, the name has disappeared and all you can see in the rear view mirror is the vehicle's grill. If the driver of that vehicle has not encouraged you to go faster, that driver will often pull out to the fast lane to pass. Three large vehicles did this to me on the 401 last Tuesday, 8 May.

We want to share the road with all licensed drivers, but we require certain qualities of these drivers. How can we encourage consideration?

WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr Laughren: I rise to bring to the attention of members yet again another problem with the Workers' Compensation Board.

For years, pharmacies have billed the WCB directly when injured workers presented their prescriptions to be filled for their compensable injuries. As of 1 May 1990, pharmacies in

the Sudbury region will no longer bill the compensation board but will bill the injured worker instead. When contacting some pharmacies, we found the reason was that it could take up to a year for reimbursement on a claim if there is any kind of hitch. It can still take up to four or five months if there are no problems at all. Therefore, the pharmacies are now asking injured workers to pay for the medication up front and then they must submit their bills to the WCB.

Many injured workers simply cannot afford the cost of this expensive medication out of their own pockets, nor should they have to. I have a friend, as a matter of fact, one of my best friends, who pays up to \$100 a month in prescriptions and he is on a disability pension.

When the injured worker submits a bill for a prescription, he is reimbursed the cost of the medication plus the \$9.50 dispensing fee to the pharmacist. There is a pharmacist where my constituency office is located in Chelmsford who has an outstanding balance of \$5,000 or \$6,000 this year alone, and a total of \$10,000.

In the long haul, it is the injured worker who suffers yet again.

ONTARIO TRAINING CORP

Mrs Cunningham: The Ontario Training Corp was established by this government on 27 April 1988 as a self-supporting enterprise with a mandate to create an environment in which employers and individuals understand the importance of lifelong learning and training.

The Ontario Training Corp appeared recently before the standing committee on government agencies and gave some very interesting testimony. Since 1988, the OTC has received some \$10.2 million in government grants; it has generated just \$50,000 in revenue during that time, for a tidy rate of return of just under 0.5%. The OTC claims that it is fulfilling "broader public policy goals." It would never measure success by a targeted return on investment. In fact, OTC brochures can say, "We take our share of revenues where we can."

Incredibly enough, the OTC is now threatening to close up shop if its grants from government are not increased above the \$6.8 million it receives annually. The Ontario Training Corp is a textbook example of government waste, with no set rate of return on investment, no desire to recover capital costs and a long-term strategic plan that had to be revised just one year into its mandate. It is little wonder that the private sector questions the efforts of the OTC and the waste of taxpayers' money.

MANITOULIN ISLAND

Mr Brown: I rise in this House today to ask all honourable members to circle the week of 21 May to 27 May on their calendars. During this week, Manitoulin Island will be hosting a display at Ontario North Now, a fascinating pavilion at Ontario Place that depicts life in northern Ontario.

In this showcase, you will be able to experience a little of the magic and mystique behind Manitoulin Island. Discover some of the island's heritage and culture, our unique lifestyle and our excellent recreational facilities.

Many organizations from across the island have come together to recreate this little bit of Manitoulin. Come and sample a small taste of the island. This exhibition could lead to the start of a beautiful friendship. Your first trip to Manitoulin will definitely not be your last.

Several of our local artists and craftspeople will be on hand displaying their works. Watch a landscape being painted, wool being spun or a wood carver at work. On 26 May, Manitoulin

Day, there will be live performances by the Burns Wharf Theatre and my favourite, the Debajehmujig, the local native theatre group.

Please be sure to take advantage of this wonderful exhibit and discover the magic that is Manitoulin.

The Speaker: That completes the allotted time for members' statements.

Hon Mr Conway: I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House so that we might welcome our colleague the member for Nipissing in his new role.

Agreed to.

MEMBER FOR NIPISSING

Hon Mr Conway: I thank my colleagues in the House for providing us with the opportunity, as custom and courtesy would dictate, to observe that the member for Nipissing has, as recent events have unfolded, taken on new responsibilities that I think should be formally observed here today, his first day in the chamber since the weekend event, which I know, speaking for myself, I watched with some real interest. I know other members of the assembly did as well.

On behalf of the Liberal caucus, I want to say most sincerely that we congratulate the member for Nipissing for a very successful campaign that reached its conclusion at, I think, about 5:15 last Saturday afternoon. I watched with some real interest as not just the member for Nipissing spoke, but the member for London North, whose contribution I tried to congratulate yesterday, and of course our friend the member for Sarnia, who in his inimitable way made quite a lively intervention as well.

I want to say, on my own behalf and on behalf of the Liberal caucus, that we congratulate the member for Nipissing. I have known the member for Nipissing for almost 10 years. We are neighbours out in that northeastern part of Ontario. I even represent a small portion of the district of Nipissing that is in the main represented by the new leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

1350

Like my friend the member for Scarborough West, I well remember the day in 1981 when the member for Nipissing arrived, along with the members for Parry Sound and Sarnia, as part of that very lively group of Conservative members elected in the campaign of 1981.

What I most remember about my friend the member for Nipissing in those early days was what a wonderful chairman he made of the standing committee on resources development, because that committee was given some very difficult and controversial legislation. As I recall, the then government's wage restraint bills were referred to the committee for which the honourable member had responsibility.

I know my friend the member for Nickel Belt would agree that while we certainly did not agree with the policy, the member for Nipissing was an exemplary chairman. One could see that he had served as a school board chair, and he handled that delicate and difficult responsibility, I thought, in a very, very exemplary way. I remember thinking that the then member for Oxford, who was having some more difficulty next door with the standing committee on administration of justice, might have done well to have followed the good example of the member for Nipissing.

Then, of course, we all remember—perhaps it was just those of us out in my part of the province—that in 1985 as the

leadership campaign to succeed Mr Davis began to take shape, I will tell members that I was very, very impressed by the depth of commitment that the member for Nipissing had to Frank Miller and he delivered to Frank Miller at a critical point and in a significant way. I well remember being invited by one of the networks to comment on the 1985 Tory leadership—that was the first edition—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Conway: I am, Mr Speaker. I will tell you, if you have been through those leadership races, you know how lively they can be. I will tell you, the member for Nipissing delivered and supported Frank Miller in a very real and significant way. Of course, shortly thereafter he joined the cabinet and he became a senior minister in the Miller government. Some of the rest of that is history and I am not going to rehash all of that story, except to say that some time later in my responsibility as House leader I came to deal with the member for Nipissing as part of the House leaders' panel. It was there that in a way I began to deal with him on a daily basis and found him to be a man who I thought was quite effective, very much the straight shooter, serious, direct, and quite a good conciliator. He often rescued the member for Windsor-Riverside and myself from perhaps some of our lively discussions. In that context I found the member for Nipissing to be a very competent and serious member of the Legislature who I thought represented his colleagues in an admirable fashion.

Now, of course, we have him in a new role. He has joined the very distinguished tradition of Progressive Conservative Party leaders in this province; a long tradition. I simply want to say to him that we on this side look very much forward to debating with him. I was struck by how anxious he was on Saturday night to engage the debate and I have engaged my friend from Nipissing in the debate.

Over the course of the past few weeks my colleagues and I have observed his positions on such things as the universality principle and social policies. We have observed his position in respect of tenants' rights. We have observed his position in respect of equity issues in terms of modern, multicultural Ontario. I can assure my friend the member for Nipissing that we will be very anxious to debate with him and his version of the Conservative Party of Ontario. That is a very important part of the democratic process.

I want to wish him well in his new responsibilities. I gather he had a very busy day yesterday. Looking across the aisle today it is obvious that the new order is taking shape, as it should, consequent upon a leadership convention.

I repeat again, the member for London North has shown herself to be a spirited, lively member of that caucus with a very definite point of view. Watching the news last night I had to share a private thought that the leader of the third party probably had as well, that the leadership campaign has encouraged her to a new participation in the public debate, not just within the party but within the Legislature and the province beyond.

So I want to say in a final note that those of us in public life know the tremendous commitment that party leaders make. I know how very difficult it is to wage one of these campaigns. I know the long hours of toil and of commitment. On many an occasion over the last few months I have seen the member for Nipissing and his colleague the member for London North heading out after a busy day in the assembly to meet the good people, whether they were in Sarnia, Manotick, Pembroke or

Lake Nipigon. It was, I think, a great credit to their commitment to cause. I think they waged a very good campaign.

I want to congratulate my friend the member for Nipissing, and on behalf of the Liberal Party of Ontario, the Liberal caucus in the chamber, we wish him all the best in his new and important responsibilities.

Mr B. Rae: I want to just say a few words to the new leader of the Conservative Party. First of all, I am sure the leader has already discovered some of the joys of his responsibilities, having had his couple of caucus meetings already.

I just would also say that I am sure the leader has already found what I found instantaneously upon my election over eight years ago—is it that long? How time flies when you are having such fun—that the only job to which it can be fairly compared is that of the manager of a baseball team because, like the manager of a baseball team, literally everyone else around you knows that he can do a better job. He will find that same joy in his decision-making and in the exercise of his authority.

I could not help observing, as one does, the fact that in the time I have been in this position the member for Nipissing is the fifth Tory leader with whom I have had good personal relations. I say to him publicly as I will say to him privately, and I hope we will have an opportunity soon for a session, that regardless of partisan differences and regardless of our philosophical differences and our differences in debate, I have always found that one of the keys to one's sanity in this place is to establish decent and good relationships with members and leaders of other parties. I have been able to do that with each one of his predecessors.

I say to the member for Nipissing, we have have had some difficult moments from time to time. I can assure him that the last conversation I had with the member for Muskoka, as he then was, was a difficult. Nevertheless I hope we maintained our mutual respect. So I say to the member for Nipissing, whatever the future may hold, and as I wish him luck—I of course do not wish him too much luck, but nevertheless a good quantity and portion—I look forward to working with him, and all of us on this side who know a little bit about the travails of public life and about the effort and energy that was required to get him where he is today, wish him well. May all his shots be on the fairway, may he make it to the green in no more than two, and may he single-putt every time.

1400

Mr Harris: I thank the House for the opportunity to allow people to say nice things about me. This, I am sure, will not happen every day in this Legislature or around Ontario.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Not until you retire from politics; so enjoy it.

Mr Harris: As my former colleague the House leader for the New Democratic Party—I say “former” in the sense that we used to work as House leaders—said, “Until you retire, this is it.” I appreciate that. I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words to my 129 friends and colleagues here in the Legislature and, indeed, those who work so hard under your auspices, Mr Speaker, to make this chamber and this Legislature work. I do not plan to take all afternoon; we have an important resolution to debate and a few questions that I want to ask as well, but I hope you will permit me to take the opportunity to say a few words and to thank a few people.

Certainly to the Minister of Education I want to say that he has been a friend. He has been a colleague. We were House leaders together. We, I think, disagreed many times. He indi-

cated in his remarks that he had an opportunity to debate with me; that is true. We kind of sparred from time to time here in this place, in many forums. I recall, I believe, in the last election in Sudbury, where we had the opportunity to go head to head or toe to toe on a number of educational issues at that time. I thought I won that debate handily. The people of this province may have felt that way, but that was not the reason how and why they were going to vote at that particular time. The people, as I have said, are always right.

I want to say, as well, that I have used comments that the member has made in the past in this House in my election material. I am not sure today whether there was anything there that I can use in the future, but I will screen through it carefully. I know there were a few things I cannot use. I want to tell him we are that close that I am not ashamed at all to use his endorsement and recommendation in that great riding of Nipissing, where there are quite a few Liberals. So I thank him for that.

An hon member: A lot of former Liberals.

Mr Harris: Fewer than there used to be. The member is quite right; a lot of former Liberals.

The leader of the New Democratic Party and of the official opposition is right: we, on a lot of issues, have not agreed since he came here eight years ago and I came here nine years ago. However, I have the utmost respect for his integrity, honesty and straightforwardness on behalf of his party, on behalf of his beliefs. I even agree on many issues and on many concerns. I share, I think, in common with him—we disagree perhaps in some areas as to how we should achieve it—why we are here and who we represent: average Ontarians, all 9.5 million of them.

I too look forward as my predecessors have passed on to me a friendship and a relationship built on trust and on those things that unite us. If I can have that trusting relationship, as my predecessors have had, I will consider myself fortunate and I will strive for that.

Let me, as well, say to the member for Sarnia—because, as was pointed out by some of the media, I was not in the House on that day when members paid tribute to the former leader; I was on tour and, as events on Saturday would have it, it was a good thing I was still out there on tour as well—to the member for Sarnia, let me add my words of congratulation, as were expressed by members from all sides of the House, on his humour and humanness, on his integrity, on how hard he fought for his beliefs, for his party, for this chamber. Surely all members would agree with me that whatever the future holds for our party, and I think obviously it is very bright, the member for Sarnia will be remembered for leading our party through a very, very difficult time. Certainly his role will never be minimized when the history of this Legislature and of my party are finally written long after we are gone.

I hope I will be permitted to say a couple of words as well about my friend, who indeed proved herself to be not only a fresh new face on the Ontario scene as she came to us two years ago as a fresh new face and captured our imagination, but in that freshness and newness demonstrated a depth of experience, talent, showed herself as a caring and compassionate person and tough, very tough, a worthy opponent but more than that, a close friend and now a confidant, now somebody who will go forward with me and will have an important role with our party, someone whose advice I personally and my caucus unanimously wish to take and rely on that experience as our party faces up to the challenges facing 9.5 million Ontarians. So I

thank the member for London North for the opportunity that she provided to our party and the choice and to me.

Mr Speaker, I know you have always been very patient on these days, and I do want to say just a few thoughts of how I feel. I am humbled. I said that on Saturday night. I am even more humbled today. Very few are given the opportunity to lead their party, and I reflected on this Saturday, Sunday and yesterday, and today as I came into this chamber. I remember back nine years ago when I first came into this chamber with such trepidation, with some fear, with some concern. It is a long way from Callander, from Lake Nipissing, to Queen's Park and to this chair, and I appreciate and am cognizant of the trust that has been placed in me. I do not diminish the challenge. I do not diminish the importance of that trust and I cherish it.

There were many new people who participated, my friends, on Saturday in a new and open democratic vote for the leader of our party. Somewhere in the gallery today the president of our party, Kay Wetherall, who with her team of men and women made work what many people—some in this room, some in these chairs, some observing us—said would not and could not work, and it worked and it worked very well and it was democratic, and I congratulate those who really did bring democracy closer to the people in a very important process, the selection of the leader of a party. There are others in this building for the very first time who are with the president. They are indeed symbolic of that process, that so many average Ontarians participated in this true democracy for the very first time.

I want to say to the Premier, who I know is delayed and will be here very shortly, and to the leader of the New Democratic Party and to my 129 friends that I have been fortunate enough to have been given the opportunity and experiences in this Legislature to work in a number of capacities, one of those as House leader. I believe I understand this Legislature and how it works as well as any member. I want to say that members will find me very, very co-operative on the process here at Queen's Park. Members will find me a staunch defender of parliamentary democracy and I will fight fiercely to protect it and to make it work.

My colleague the member for London North and I found as we travelled this province and over 500 communities in the past year and a half that there are many, many Ontarians—I suggest to members, the majority—who for one reason or another are fed up with the whole lot of us. So I will strive in a totally non-partisan way with the members, my 129 honourable colleagues, to try to bring parliamentary democracy back closer to the people and to try to bring the people back closer to us, to bring integrity back into the system, to have our profession—I know all the members as individuals and I know why all of them ran. They all ran for the most noble of reasons and we are here for the most noble of reasons, but they would agree with me that our profession today is not perceived that way, and I will strive for that change.

1410

When I leave politics, whenever that is—hopefully voluntarily—if it can be said that I played a small role in bringing parliamentary democracy back closer to the people, I will have felt that everything that I have done is worth while.

[Applause]

Mr Harris: Members can applaud that. I think that was worth while.

There is more happening around this province than just this chamber. My tour director is at this moment completing a schedule of community debates that I will send over to the Premier to see if he can fit into his schedule later this week, for I believe that we must get back to talk to the people. My colleague and I have been most fortunate to have the opportunity to do that. We were astounded at how much people are thirsting for all of us to be closer to them, not just at election time, but in a consultative fashion in how we govern.

On the issues of concern to people, the members will find me quite combative. On partisan issues, I will be partisan. I believe we are elected here at the pleasure of the electorate. We are here to serve nine million Ontarians, and I do not believe it is government's role to be all things to all people. I do not believe that and I will fight to minimize government's intrusion into the personal lives of individual Ontarians. We must strive to provide a competitive tax climate, fair rules for all, so that all Ontarians will have an opportunity to fulfil their dreams and, if they work hard, to succeed.

We are also elected to protect and assist the minorities, the poor, the defenceless, those who need help, those less fortunate, the elderly, the sick. Why they need help, my friends, does not matter, but government is indeed elected by all to be most generous to those who need our help. I will fight for policies and programs that indeed will provide that help in a most generous fashion.

Finally, let me say this. We politicians should take our roles very seriously; however, we ought not to take ourselves nearly so seriously. My colleague and I found that out as well when we were on the road this past period of time. Under my leadership, we will fight for all Ontarians.

Friends, today my mother cannot be here. It is her 75th birthday. I want to say, "Happy birthday, mom; your pension is secure."

PATRICIA STARR INQUIRY

Mr D. S. Cooke: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: On 23 April you gave a ruling with regard to a matter that had been raised by the House leader for the third party and the implications of the Supreme Court decision coming out of the Patti Starr inquiry and the decision by the Supreme Court. In that decision you indicated that basically it was not your job to determine what the implications would be for the House or for the standing committees. It is my understanding that the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly is now looking at the matter, as you recommended in your decision.

My concern is first of all that right after your decision, the clerks of the standing committees met to determine the implications of your decision on the standing committees and their procedures for this Legislature. Then the standing committee on general government met last week to look at a referral under our new rules of the 12 hours that is a portion for opposition parties. The referral was from the member for Leeds-Grenville.

It is my understanding that in the steering committee, while the matter was being considered, advice was offered by the clerk of the committee that the Supreme Court decision should be taken into consideration and what implications it might have. Now I think that while that is not a direct intervention by the clerk in terms of the implications of the Supreme Court decision, it certainly has a substantial effect on decisions that will be made by committees and how they proceed.

I would ask you, Mr Speaker, to look into this matter and I think instruction should be given to the clerks of the committees that until the standing committee on the Legislative As-

sembly has reported on this matter, interventions as a result of the Supreme Court decision should not be made in our standing committees, since they and we cannot determine what the implications are. That is the purpose, as your decision indicates, of the matter being studied by the Legislative Assembly committee.

The Speaker: I do appreciate the point raised by the honourable member and, as always, I certainly will review the matter and discuss it further with him.

ORAL QUESTIONS

POLICE USE OF FIREARMS

Mr B. Rae: Mr Speaker, I should tell you from the outset that I have a question for the Premier, but I will stand it down expecting him to return before the conclusion of question period. In the absence of the Premier, I have a question to the Solicitor General.

It is now over a year and a half, indeed nearly two years, since the tragic shooting of Lester Donaldson. We have heard today of yet another tragic shooting by the police of a young man who is black. I want to ask the Solicitor General why it is that really nothing has changed with respect to the kind of investigation that is taking place, the regulations with respect to the use of force by police officers, the question of police chases and the whole field of race relations.

In terms of the detailed training of police officers, I would like to ask the Solicitor General why it would be, nearly two years after the tragic shooting of Lester Donaldson, over a year since the shooting of Wade Lawson, now with this shooting of young Mr Neal, that in terms of the obligations of the police and the obligations of this government to bring in reforms that will make a difference, they have not happened.

Hon Mr Offer: Let me first say that when there is an incident such as occurred yesterday, it is both troubling and very concerning to me and, I note, to not only all members of this Legislature but everyone in the province. I would like to inform you, Mr Speaker, and all members that in this matter, charges have been laid against the officer in question dealing with criminal negligence causing bodily harm.

Dealing with the Leader of the Opposition's specific question, I would like to indicate that I think it is improper or certainly factually incorrect to say that this government has done nothing in this regard. I think that you, Mr Speaker, and all members of this Legislature will be the first to know that currently on the books of this Legislature is a new Police Services Act, Bill 107, the first change in the Police Act since 1949, changes which address investigating police through a special investigative unit, dealing with employment equity, dealing with a province-wide police complaint system where now there such a system is only available in Toronto.

I think that the Leader of the Opposition will also be aware that there is a great deal of work which is—

1420

The Speaker: Thank you. Order.

Mr B. Rae: Obviously we cannot comment on the incident in detail now because charges have been laid. I understand that. But I am talking about the responsibilities of the government and the responsibilities of the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

The hard fact of the matter is that we have had commission reports and we have had task force recommendations, which do not require changes to the Police Act. The minister could move

ahead with respect to the question of the use of force and send out a very clear message as to what the policy of the government of Ontario is. He could have sent that out over a year ago, after he had the very clear recommendation from the Clare Lewis task force that the rules with respect to the use of force should be changed. He could have acted several months ago. That message could have been sent very clearly from his government. Why has that not been done?

Hon Mr Offer: I think the Leader of the Opposition again is, with respect, factually incorrect. There was a very important report which was commissioned by the Lewis task force. The Race Relations and Policing Task Force came forward with 47 very important recommendations, recommendations which the Leader of the Opposition will know we have responded to and agreed to, not only in terms of the wording of those recommendations but in dealing with the direction that those recommendations went forward in.

We are moving in all of those areas. We recognize the need that many of those recommendations do require legislative framework. That legislation is currently introduced in this Legislature. We are ready to move on that. We are ready to move on the new Police Services Act, which deals with a special investigative unit, which talks to employment equity, which talks to a province-wide police complaint system. We are ready to deal with that bill. We have addressed that and we want to continue.

Mr B. Rae: I want to say to the minister that this bill can be called any time. Enough of the bamboozle. He knows perfectly well who is responsible for calling and not calling legislation; the government is. He knows perfectly well that he could have moved on many of these recommendations without having to change the law. He knows that as well. They are matters of administration. That could change now.

Specifically on the question of the use of force, the task force recommended very clearly that no member of a police force shall draw his revolver except when he believes it may be necessary for the protection of his or her life or the life of another. That recommendation has been made very clearly. What is stopping the minister from sending out a message with respect to the use of force? This cannot be allowed to continue and it is the government, by failing to state very clearly where it is going, that has led to a widespread impression that there has been much talk but it has not been followed by enough action.

Hon Mr Offer: With respect to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, we have been ready to deal with this particular piece of legislation since I made a commitment to introduce the legislation before the new year. That is what we did in fact. I said we would introduce a new Police Services Act before the new year. We did it, and when all was said and done it was the opposition that was talking on another piece of legislation that in many ways stopped us from dealing with this particular piece of legislation.

On the member's specific question on use of force, I think he will recognize that what we are talking about is in very large part a change to the Canadian Criminal Code, subsection 25(4). He will also know that in our response to the Lewis task force report on race relations and policing, one of our responses was to petition the federal government to call upon the Attorney General of this province to call upon the federal government to make that change. We have already done that. We are waiting for the federal government to respond so that there can be a consistent approach with respect to the use of force in this province.

POLICE COMMISSION NOMINATION

Mr B. Rae: I have a question for the Premier. Last June the Premier and I had several exchanges in this House with regard to the proposed appointment of Elvio DelZotto to the Ontario Police Commission. At that time, the Premier assured me that he had looked at the files and all he had found was a letter from Mrs Starr; that apart from the letter from Mrs Starr, as far as he was concerned, there was no other correspondence or material relating to it, and that this was all there was to this particular question as to whether or not Mr DelZotto had been recommended.

It would now appear from an article which appeared this weekend in the *Globe and Mail* that in fact the Attorney General of the province sent a letter to the then Solicitor General, in which he stated, "I trust that you will give this nomination every consideration when a position becomes vacant." Those are the words of the Attorney General. Can the Premier explain why he did not tell us about this letter or why he did not know about this letter when he stated to the House that all there was was a letter from Mrs Starr?

Hon Mr Peterson: Because I did not have the letter. Presumably if there is a letter, it is in the files of the Solicitor General. That is why.

Mr B. Rae: I asked the Premier very specifically about whether he had asked the Solicitor General. We had the assurances from the Premier that were very clear that, as far as he was concerned, there were no other recommendations.

The Attorney General, if I may say so, was sitting in his seat all that time. He could, it seems to me, perhaps have searched his memory as to whether this recommendation had not crossed his desk. He did not say, "Let's have lunch some day." He did not say, "I am sending you this letter but it doesn't mean anything." He said, "I trust that you will give this nomination every consideration when a position becomes vacant."

That is a very specific recommendation from the Attorney General of the province to the Solicitor General with respect to the appointment of Mr DelZotto to the Ontario Police Commission.

I want to ask the Premier, first of all, why was he not able to find out that the Attorney General in fact had recommended DelZotto to the police commission? Why would the Premier be telling us last year that this recommendation came from nobody inside the government, that it simply came from Mrs Starr? We now have the paper trail that tells us it came from the Attorney General himself.

Hon Mr Peterson: In fact, my honourable friend misrepresents the facts. That was a form letter, as I read it, and it was not a recommendation at all.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Final supplementary.

Mr B. Rae: Let's have this out. First of all, the Premier says that I am misrepresenting the facts. I appreciate that comment from the Premier since it is clearly unparliamentary. But I will say to the Premier, if he is standing in his place and saying that his Attorney General, as a matter of fact, stamps every letter that comes to him from some lobbyist outside saying that so-and-so should be on the police commission, which is a position of enormous public responsibility, and that the Attorney General thinks so little of the value of his signature that no matter who that person is, despite the fact that he was named in

front of a royal commission with respect to organized crime in relation to the construction industry 12 or 13 years ago—

Interjections.

Mr B. Rae: That is a fact.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I recognized the member for the final supplementary question. Will you place it?

Mr B. Rae: I want to ask how it is that the Premier can seriously say, when he has a letter from the Attorney General that says, "I trust that you will give this nomination every consideration when a position becomes vacant," that this is just a form comment. That is a comment recommending Mr DelZotto for this position.

Hon Mr Peterson: With the greatest respect, the member is factually incorrect and he is getting all exercised about an appointment that was not made. It just shows how desperate he is.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. New question, the member for Nipissing.

Mr Harris: I thank the Premier for standing to acknowledge me and I accept that as acceptance of my challenge to tour this province and debate. I know he will say at some point in time we will be doing that.

The Speaker: The question is to whom?

1430

TAXATION

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Premier. I read with disbelief the comments of the Treasurer in a speech yesterday to the Empire Club, I believe it was. The Treasurer acknowledged, first of all, that inflation was a major problem. He acknowledged, I believe, in that speech that he supported Mr Crow's initiatives to control inflation. He suggested perhaps a little different timetable today, but I think that was the gist of the speech.

What the Treasurer said that really stretched the limits of my credibility, or credulity in his case, was that he actually blamed federal tax increases for the jump in inflation. I would ask the Premier if he agrees with the Treasurer that tax increases are causing this pressure on inflation that is causing the difficulty with the bank rate and interest rates and all the rest of the problems we are having. If he does, how can he possibly criticize the federal government, which has increased its taxes one half as much as the Premier and the Treasurer have right here in this province?

Hon Mr Peterson: Mr Speaker, I apologize that I missed Thursday last when the former interim leader stepped down and may I just beg your indulgence for a moment to take—

Mr Brandt: Take as much time as you want.

Hon Mr Peterson: He has a lot of time on his hands now and we are prepared to reciprocate.

May I just say to my friend the member for Sarnia that I have some understanding of the difficulties of leading a political party. I think we could share that. There are certainly three or four of us in the House who know those difficulties now, and there is another new one who is going to know it very soon, if he does not know already.

But I say to my honourable friend, I think when the history of the Conservative Party is written, it is going to owe him a great debt for the great skills he brought. I know the difficulties, as I have said. He has managed to do that by remaining a popular and trusted member of this House with colleagues on all sides. Indeed, that is a rare gift that few have.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Peterson: Certainly my friend the member for Nickel Belt does not have that and we can see the envy coming forward from his little face at the present time.

The Speaker: Now the response.

Hon Mr Peterson: The member for Sarnia really is our favourite version of the Adult Mutant Ninja Tory and I want him to know that.

To the new leader, I cannot really say I wish him well, but I can offer him my best wishes on this occasion. He has assumed great responsibilities. He has great experience in this House, and he has many friends who like and trust him, although there are many who are not going to make his job nearly as easy now as it was before. I, like others, am looking forward to engaging in that debate starting right now, after I say something nice about the member for London North.

As I regarded that leadership, being from London, members can understand there is sort of a natural affection for anyone from London, and particularly this member, whom I have known for a very long time. I watched that campaign. I know a little bit about them. I have won one and I lost one. I know of the great commitment of heart and energy. I know the great rush of adrenalin and I know also the pain of defeat as adrenalin leaves the body as well. In my view, the member has served the process and her party very well and I congratulate my friend the member for London North.

For the first day, that was really quite a ridiculous question, let me tell my friend. My friend, who is in favour of taxing food—this man wants to have the goods and services tax—standing his first day in the House and defending Michael Wilson and John Crow is absolutely beyond me. The member has to learn in this business. I have a little more experience. He should cut bait when he has a chance. He is going to have to defend Mr Wilson, as he is doing right now. I want him to compare this Treasurer to Mr Wilson. This man has balanced the budget twice in the last two years. We can compare them. Mr Wilson drives up the interest rates, drives up the deficit. His excise taxes contributed almost 1% to inflation last year.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr Harris: Mr Speaker, could I go back to the original question? Does the Premier agree with the Treasurer, who (a) says tax increases are the main cause for the inflationary pressures in this country and that he supports Mr Crow's initiatives to suppress inflation and (b) blames the federal government, which has increased its taxes half as much as the Treasurer has?

Hon Mr Peterson: Sure. The excise taxes from the federal government have had a profound influence on this. Look at this government in Ottawa. They came in with a manufacturers' sales tax at 8%. Members can help me out if I am wrong. They increased that by 50% to 13.5%. They called it the silent killer of jobs. There is not a lot of credibility in that. Then they are moving us on to a consumer tax which is going to be highly inflationary at a very fragile time.

I say to my friend, this government has balanced the budget two years in a row and has not contributed to inflation. It is the excise taxes of Mr Wilson that are doing so. I am sure my honourable friend or his finance critic, whoever that is, understands that. Certainly the member for Nickel Belt does.

Mr Harris: I assume the Premier does agree with the Treasurer that tax increases by a government are the main cause of the inflationary pressures. I assume, since he refuses to answer, the Premier agrees with his Treasurer's defence of Mr Crow's policy to try to combat this, that he has no choice if governments are going to increase taxes the way they have.

Since the Premier wants to talk federal issues, I have a little chart here. What we have here is the tax revenue in 1984-85. This is the rate of inflation if we increased our tax revenue at the rate of inflation, and this is how much the Premier and the Treasurer have increased taxation in Ontario—twice as fast as the federal government has. I want him to realize that this, cumulatively, is \$46 billion new tax revenue in excess of the rate of inflation.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Harris: Where does he get off talking about the federal government? We are elected by the people of Ontario. Does he agree—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Peterson: Far be it from me to give the honourable member advice, even though he is new and I think maybe I have the right. Does the member know one of the things I first learned when I became leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition? That was, never rely on federal research. He should build his own research department. Then he will not come into the House and embarrass himself.

What he is holding up is the graph of prosperity in this province. We have lead the industrialized world. What he is holding up is two balanced budgets. Mr Wilson raises the interest rates, raises the deficit. I ask the member the member any time—and I am happy to debate with him—to compare the books of this province and of this Treasurer with any other government resident in this province and he will see somebody who knows what he is doing here.

The Speaker: New question, the member for Nipissing.

Mr Harris: It is \$46 billion of prosperity for the Premier and his friends and the friends of the Liberal Party.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. The question is to which minister?

1440

WASTE REDUCTION

Mr Harris: I have a new question for the Premier. The average family rips its way through about a ton of packaging a year. About 80% of it ends up in dumps or incinerators. Yesterday, the Minister of the Environment said he would be spending close to \$55 million on the 3R program. So far, the minister's plans have focused on recycling. He has effectively compromised the regulation on refillable soft drink containers to allow more waste to fuel the blue boxes. We have seen very little from the minister and the government in the way of promoting reduction and reuse, the first two, and in my view

the most important of the 3Rs. How much of the \$55 million will be devoted to the reduction of excess packaging?

Hon Mr Peterson: I think the honourable Minister of the Environment can tell the member about his very ambitious programs. I know the member has missed them during the campaign.

The Speaker: It has been referred to the Minister of the Environment.

Hon Mr Bradley: I, as well, congratulate the member for Nipissing on his ascension to the position of leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and wish him well personally in his leadership of that party.

In regard to the question that he asked, the member may know that there have been considerable discussions that have taken place for a period of months over the issue of packaging and how best, on a national level, with all provinces making a contribution to it, we can in fact reduce that.

As a result, at the meeting which took place in Vancouver, after many months of discussions and a task force, which included people from the environmental community, people from the industry, people from various governments, including the provincial government of Ontario, we were in a position on that occasion to effect a national protocol which is supported by all of the provinces, which in fact calls for those kinds of reductions in such things as the packaging field.

That was, I think, hailed quite widely and objectively across the country. We expect, as a result of the team effort that we have put forward, along with the other provinces, which have adopted our goals of 25% and 50%, that we will achieve those kinds of results with which even the member will be impressed.

Mr Harris: I assume not one cent. The question was how much of the \$55 million; I assume not one cent.

The minister talked about the national protocol on packaging that was signed in March in Vancouver. That, I understand, is voluntary for the first two years and it counts on industry to set the pace. It has been two months since the protocol was signed and the federal-provincial implementation committee was established. The first two years of this policy will deal only in a voluntary way with primary packaging; that is, from the manufacturer to the retailer. It calls for the reduction, as the minister said, of 20% by 1992, while the minister is demanding municipalities reduce the same amount of garbage to landfills by 25% in the very same period. Does the minister really believe that this stick-and-carrot approach will work when everything is voluntary, when he is leaving industries on their own and when he is falling substantially behind other provinces and other jurisdictions on this continent?

Hon Mr Bradley: I think any objective observer who has looked at this would indicate that the statement of the leader of the third party is simply not correct, because virtually every other jurisdiction is looking to what we are doing in Ontario. When we won the United Nations environment program award, for instance, there were many others who hailed what the people of Ontario, not just the government of Ontario, have been doing to work on that.

The member would also recognize, through the industrial 3Rs program that we have in the province—and the man who now leads the party is, I think, a believer in the private sector, for instance, the initiatives in the private sector—that this government has provided funding to those who have innovative ideas, who in fact are recycling some of the material that they produce, are reducing some of the material that they produce,

are reusing some of the material that they produce in terms of the industrial sector. In the industrial sector, there have been some rather substantial volumes that have been created in years gone by.

With this program that we have dedicated to this and which I think others are now observing to adopt in many other jurisdictions, we are finding the kinds of reductions that others simply are not achieving. I would expect we will certainly meet our goals.

The Speaker: The member for Nipissing may have a supplementary and want some further information.

Mr Harris: The minister says other jurisdictions are watching Ontario. They are; they are watching and they are laughing. British Columbia, Alberta and Quebec have mandatory deposit systems for non-refillable soft drink containers. In Alberta the legislation also applies to liquor and wine bottles and fruit and vegetable drink cans. In some states, sales of non-refillable glass containers are prohibited outright. They are all now ahead of Ontario and have caught up and passed this government in the last six years.

Many initiatives have been considered in state legislatures to reduce the waste from packaging. Italy is now very close to a decree on requiring all packaging and wrapping to be made of recycled fibre. Even the city of Toronto, in the absence of the government, is now planning to bring forward legislation on its own to deal with the retailers' shelves and the percentage of non-refillable soft drink containers.

When are we going to catch up to these other jurisdictions? And how much of the \$55 million is being spent on reducing the amount of garbage going into the blue boxes?

Hon Mr Bradley: The member mentions other jurisdictions. I wonder, when our ministry officials are constantly meeting with people from other jurisdictions, why they are extolling the virtues of our particular programs. For instance, we offer people in this province a choice and people are exercising that choice in great numbers in the number of products they are purchasing, which would result in reduction and reuse as well as recycling.

Our diversion goals in household waste, for instance, are unmatched in terms of the 14% diversion we are achieving at the present time and will continue to achieve and build upon. The government of Ontario itself, through the Minister of Government Services—and I was with him when he made the announcement—indicated that, unlike when the member's government was in power, it is embarking upon a program through its procurement policies and through its policing of utilizing products, machines and so on which would enhance the opportunity to reduce the amount of paper we would use, for instance. We are moving decidedly in that direction, and I would expect that many other jurisdictions are going to do the same.

But I say to the member that we constantly have people coming from abroad, even from the European Community—

The Speaker: Order.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr R. F. Johnston: My question is of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. On 28 October, his predecessor established Vision 2000, a major review of the college system in Ontario 25 years after its establishment. The final report has been in the minister's hands probably for as long as it has been in mine. I was impressed by some of the recommendations: to

increase the general education content of the colleges; a massive change in employment equity, which puts the minister's government to shame in terms of what it has been doing; advanced training proposals for a provincial institute; annual access and success analyses; a human resource development plan which is quite exceptional.

I was wondering how long it is going to be before the minister shares these wonderful recommendations with the general public and how long he is going to keep them all to himself.

Hon Mr Conway: Not very long at all.

Mr R. F. Johnston: I am pleased and also delighted by the short answer. There are 60 quite remarkable recommendations in this report and some of them require funding from the minister, funding for preparatory courses, for the co-ordination of adult basic education, for establishing a floor below which funding must not go and an Ontario learning for life fund, as well as the establishment of an implementation committee.

Is it the minister's intention to support those recommendations and to establish that implementation committee as soon as possible?

Hon Mr Conway: I am very pleased to have the opportunity to spend a moment talking about the report of the Vision 2000 group that has been at work over the last number of months, quite a good collaborative group that has obviously been in touch with my friend the member for Scarborough West. I can tell him that the government is very anxious not just to look to, but to act upon, a number of recommendations coming forward, by the way, not just from this group. As he knows, the Premier's Council on technology has been busily at work as well on human resource strategy for the 1990s and beyond.

I have to say in conclusion that the Treasurer's commitment to our college sector over the last few years, both on operating and capital, has been exemplary. That, above and beyond all else, should encourage my friend from Scarborough West about the hope for future implementation of a number of recommendations.

1450

TORONTO WATERFRONT

Mr Cousens: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Last week, I asked the minister to explain his support for the province's proposal on Harbourfront. There is no doubt that there is a great deal that has to be done with the developers to work out a deal, and there is no doubt that our party is very supportive of opening up the waterfront so that people of the greater Toronto area and of the province can enjoy those lands.

Specifically, I asked him about concessions made to developers in order to free the south side of Queen's Quay of the development. At that time he told us that the arrangement was simply a site-by-site exchange. Yet his own report states that in addition to a free replacement site for each of the developer's projects, the developers would each receive free title to other parcels of land that they currently lease. In effect, they are making no payments whatsoever to Harbourfront for this public land.

Since last week we asked for the details of the agreement with those developers and have not received them, I would like to ask the minister to please tell this House the exact terms of this agreement with Huang and Danczkay, the Hawley group and Ramparts.

Hon Mr Sweeney: At the present time the agreements, as the honourable member refers to them, are in the hands of the former Treasurer of Ontario, Darcy McKeough. As the member knows, he is representing the government and meeting, either personally or through others, with the various developers who were involved in this process.

Let me reiterate that the exchange of land from the water's edge to immediately north of Queen's Quay was that: site-for-site exchange. Another part of the arrangement, totally another part of the arrangement, was a strong recommendation from this government to the federal government that where there were long-time lease arrangements it would be preferable if those long-time lease arrangements were bought out and a cash transfer made to Harbourfront. My understanding was that that would net Harbourfront somewhere in the neighbourhood of about \$15 million, but I could be a little off on that one. But that was not in any way a giveaway. It would be cashing it out; in other words, looking over the next 60-year period, putting a value on those leases, cashing it out and giving that cash to Harbourfront as a programming entity.

Mr Cousens: Without the deals being made public and shared with us as we hoped, and dealing with the information that the minister has given and we have read in the report, it would really appear that there is a sweetheart deal here and that the government has given the store away to try to get a deal.

Let's turn to the costs involved in carrying out this proposal with the developers. The minister stated last week that the deal was done free of charge to any level of government, even though some were saying it could not be done for less than \$100 million. How can the minister make such a claim, that the deal is free of charge, when according to Harbourfront officials the cost is actually \$86 million in public lands and resources, not including the revenue that is lost from leasing fees and parking? How can the minister make these claims when the developers seem to be making out so well in this arrangement?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I think the honourable member is misunderstanding Harbourfront's claim. What it is clearly saying is that there are now three sites on the water's edge that would have been developed that will now not be developed. The value of those three sites, had they been developed and had that money accrued to Harbourfront, would have been in the neighbourhood of what he is speaking of. It is not money that went to anyone else. It is money that in fact is not going to be accrued. That land will remain as park land, under the jurisdiction of the city of Toronto, for all of the people of the province.

It is quite true that there are a number of other sites at Harbourfront that will not be developed that could have been developed and would have an accrued value were they developed. So it is not a case of anyone getting that money; it is a case of its not being transferred because the land is not going to be sold. That is where there is, as far as Harbourfront is concerned, a net loss to it. If members understand what that loss means, again, for the people of Ontario—

The Speaker: Order.

TEACHERS' LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Chiarelli: My question is directed to the Minister of Education concerning the unfortunate elementary school teachers' strike at the Ottawa Board of Education, which has now dragged on for some 19 schooldays. I am concerned about an apparent lack of good faith on the part of some of the trustees at the OBE. Almost since the first day of this strike, my Ottawa office has received numerous telephone calls from

anxious parents stating that they have been told by trustees that if they want a solution they should call their MPP or the minister. This is irresponsible buck-passing. Can the minister indicate where the real responsibility currently rests for a solution to this problem?

Hon Mr Conway: I appreciate the honourable member's concern and, quite frankly, that of all Ottawa-Carleton area members of the Legislature. As we all know, these kinds of difficulties, particularly as they affect students, are never easy. It is my view that both parties to this dispute have it within their power to resolve this at the table. The Education Relations Commission is monitoring the situation on a daily basis. I would like to take this opportunity to once again strongly encourage both parties to this dispute to accept their responsibilities under the collective bargaining process and under Bill 100 and to resolve this in the best interests of these students at the earliest opportunity.

Mr Chiarelli: Some of these trustees are now privately urging MPPs to prevail upon the Education Relations Commission not to deal with the question of jeopardy before the summer. This position is surprising, coming at a time when parents are feeling helpless and frustrated about the welfare of their children. Can the minister indicate for these parents the role of the Education Relations Commission on this very important matter?

Hon Mr Conway: I can tell my honourable friend that the Education Relations Commission has very clear authority and jurisdiction under Bill 100 to monitor and to assist in these kinds of disputes. Under the act, it is the exclusive responsibility of the Education Relations Commission to make a finding of jeopardy. That they have not yet done in this particular dispute at the Ottawa Board of Education. But the commission has independent authority and exclusive responsibility.

Once again, I repeat that I expect that everyone involved in this dispute would want to see this resolved in the best interests of the students concerned. It is my view that the collective bargaining process is the best process we have. I know it is not easy, I know it is sometimes difficult, but I must insist that both parties accept their responsibilities and get this resolved in the interest of those students at the earliest opportunity.

TAXATION

Mr Laughren: I have a question for the Treasurer about his amazing tax system in this province. Last week, we raised with him the example of a couple of corporations, both wealthy. In 1988, Tridel earned operating income of \$66 million, distributed dividends to shareholders and paid no taxes. In 1989, Bramalea had operating income of \$123 million, distributed dividends to shareholders and paid no taxes whatsoever. At the same time that these companies were getting off so lightly, individuals in the province of Ontario were treated as follows: A single mother with two children, earning \$22,000 a year, will be paying \$850 in Ontario income tax, and a married couple with two children and one earner, making \$22,400 a year, will be paying \$850 a year in Ontario income tax.

Could the Treasurer tell us, is it possible that he is not having second thoughts about a tax system that lets off easily those people with the ability to pay while clobbering those people with the least ability to pay?

1500

Mr Pouliot: Don't tell us about incentives, please.

Hon R. F. Nixon: I was just going to talk to the honourable member about incentives. He is aware, of course, that our Corporations Tax Act parallels almost precisely the federal act; as a matter of fact, it automatically parallels it unless we take action in this House to do otherwise. He is suggesting an independent role of action there, and his leader has indicated on a number of occasions that we should be independent in our personal income tax policy as well. Those are things that are under consideration at all times, but my own view is that we have to understand that corporations must be encouraged to make capital commitments in this jurisdiction.

When it comes to the real estate area, there is a matter of special concern, particularly with the profits that the honourable member refers to, which are well known. They have had very profitable times and they continue investing in land, which is the basis of further development and expansion.

Mr Laughren: That does not explain at all why the Treasurer does not put in place, for example, a minimum corporate tax. It does not explain that at all.

I also want to know if the Treasurer would be having second thoughts about his own budget, in which he gave \$140 million new money from the taxpayers to the corporate sector in the form of the current cost allowance. He makes the argument that that is to encourage investment, but at the same time he does that, instead of \$140 million to those least able to pay, he offers them \$38 million in the form of his tax reduction program. Does the Treasurer really think it is appropriate to give those who already have more ability to pay a \$140-million windfall, while giving those with the least ability to pay only a \$38-million windfall?

Hon R. F. Nixon: The honourable member is correct in his numbers but, I believe, incorrect in his conclusion, because the \$38 million is added to a wide variety of other payments that are designed to help low-income people, including seniors, with the reduction of personal income tax payable. As a matter of fact, the cost of those tax concessions is about \$1 billion, not \$38 million.

At the same time, the honourable member, being a good socialist, wants to see that jobs are provided for people in all parts of this community, not just in Sudbury. I respect his view in that regard, which I strongly support. In this connection, we feel that improving—in fact, doubling—the current cost allowance improves our competitive position here so that capital that might otherwise be invested in other jurisdictions will be invested here for the strength of our own economy and developing jobs in Ontario.

TRANSPORTATION FOR THE DISABLED

Mrs Marland: My question is to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons. The Ministry of Transportation recently released its fourth annual fact book on Transportation for Disabled Persons in Ontario. This book outlines basic data on special transit services offered in 70 municipalities across the province for the 1988 calendar year. Among the data is the number of unaccommodated trip requests, and that is the annual number of trip requests that cannot be accommodated at the time requested or at a reasonable alternative time on the same day due to insufficient service. The fact book indicates that disabled persons living in Toronto were refused rides on 88,942 separate occasions. I would like to know whether the minister finds this acceptable.

Hon Ms Collins: I can tell the member that improving transportation for disabled people in this province is a top

priority for this government, and I think that has been shown on a number of occasions, especially in past budgets. In fact, in 1988-89 the province provided \$24 million in subsidies for specialized transit systems across the province. There has also been an expansion in the eligibility criteria for use of specialized transit, which will cost the province \$5.2 million by year 5 of implementation and will benefit over 22,000 new riders in the province.

Mrs Marland: I am sure this minister must be aware of the difficulties encountered by a disabled person when it comes to public transit. Rides have to be booked days in advance. Disabled persons are forced to plan their activities around the available rides, rather than having services provided to meet their needs. Now we find out that these persons have their requests for rides refused on a regular basis—88,942 times in Toronto for the year 1988. The final question is, what is the minister going to do to ensure that disabled persons in Ontario get the transportation services they need when and where they need them?

Hon Ms Collins: I can tell the member that the Minister of Transportation has been moving in a number of areas as far as transportation for the disabled is concerned. In fact, in the recent announcement that was made, the \$5-billion announcement in transportation for Metropolitan Toronto, the minister did talk about protecting future access to the conventional transit system. There has also been an allocation of more money towards accessible taxis in the province as well. And the minister has endorsed a report prepared by the Task Force on Improved Accessibility to Conventional Transit Services for Frail and Ambulatory Disabled Persons, which recommended the introduction of over 100 features to improve the accessibility of conventional transit systems so that more disabled people can be accommodated in that system.

TRUCK IDENTIFICATION

Mr Tatham: My question is for the Minister of Transportation. My question is on trucks and trailers on Ontario highways and the identification thereof. What type of identification do they need, signing on trucks and trailers?

Hon Mr Wrye: The honourable member would know that all vehicles, whether they are trucks or others, must have as their primary form of identification a licence plate which must be plainly visible and in sight. I understand the honourable member's concern is that this has not always been the case, but that is certainly the primary method of identification. In addition, though, higher vehicles and vehicles over a certain weight, about 8,200 kilograms, must have the name and address of the owner printed on each side of the vehicle; again that should be plainly visible. As well, there is additional identification needed for those vehicles which are transporting goods under the Dangerous Goods Transportation Act. So all are in place, depending on the kind of vehicle, but the main identification is plate identification.

Mr Tatham: If they are not identified, what action should be taken?

Hon Mr Wrye: If they are not identified, if there is no plate identification or indeed other identification as required under a series of acts, charges can be laid. Indeed, the police are on the highway more rigorously enforcing the law than ever before. The honourable member will know that our colleague the Solicitor General has recently hired more than 100 additional Ontario Provincial Police officers to control our roads, par-

ticularly the 400 series of highways. As these matters are brought to their attention, either on the highway or at the various inspection stations, which the honourable member would know are open at various times on the 400 series of highways, charges under the Highway Traffic Act can follow.

RENT REVIEW

Mr D. S. Cooke: I have a question to the Minister of Housing. Tenants at 96 and 166 Jameson here in Toronto faced a rent increase in 1989 of 35% and in 1990 of another 50%, for a total, when compounded, of 103% on their rent. Most of the rent increase is due to renovations, renovations the tenants do not agree with. They have been given the notice that is now required under the minister's regulations, but the fact of the matter is it has had absolutely no impact as to what the landlord intends to do. Their rents will still be going up by 103%.

An example of a rent increase is from \$437.60 per month to \$886.50 per month for a two-bedroom. When is the minister going to come to the realization that unless he takes real action to change the Liberal rent review law, we are going to be losing the little affordable rental housing we now have in Ontario?

Hon Mr Sweeney: As the honourable member knows, the changes in the regulations have been in effect for a relatively short period of time. We are beginning to get feedback that they are making a difference. No one indicated that it was going to be the sole answer. As a matter of fact, I indicated clearly that I would be monitoring them for at least 12 months to see what the impact would be.

I would point out to my honourable friend, as I am sure he well knows, that what in fact landlords ask for is not necessarily what they get. As a matter of fact, in the last three or four months something like about 2,000 landlords who have made applications got either 50% less than what they asked for or 25% less than what they asked for. I do not know what the situation is going to be in this particular case, but I expect that the new regulations will have an impact.

1510

Mr D. S. Cooke: We have also raised cases in the House where a certain amount of increase has been asked by a landlord and the minister's rent review commission comes down and gives him 75% and 80% more than he has asked for. That is how his rent review system works.

The tenants in these buildings today have gone to court because they have given up on any hope that the minister might come in and try to protect tenants of this province. Is that his solution for protection of our affordable rental housing in this province, that tenants like the people at 221 Balliol Street are going to have to spend tens of thousands of dollars on legal fees in order to protect their rent and affordable housing because the minister has just sold out to the landlords and the developers of this province? Is that what the tenants are going to have to do in this province?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I would suggest to the honourable member that this is not exactly the way the situation is out there. In fact, as I have indicated to him before, something like 83% of the tenants in this province get rent increases that are at the guideline; the roughly 17% who in fact go to rent review get increases on average that are about 10.5%. I have a list of requests here indicating what in fact was asked for: 46%, received 9%; 21%, received 4%; 25%, received 4%; 14%, received 7%; 195%, received 11%. The list goes on and on and on. I think there are just as many cases where in fact in the final

analysis the tenants get a much lower increase than what their landlords asked for, and I think the new regulation is going to make a significant impact on that whole process.

CHICKEN INDUSTRY

Mr Villeneuve: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Earlier this month he assured this House that the consumers and restaurateurs of this province would have an adequate supply of chicken over the summer. The record now shows that he did not say where this chicken would be coming from. Will the minister today tell this House what he has done in recent weeks to ensure that Ontario producers will indeed be supplying the chicken required by Ontario consumers?

Hon Mr Ramsay: I am glad to be asked by the honourable member where the chickens will be coming from. Not only do I have to promise that we will have chickens, but now I have to identify the place of origin of these chickens. At this particular moment I cannot do that, but I would like to tell the member and the other members of the House that we are working diligently, day by day, on this issue. Since I last spoke to the member, I have met twice with the board and the processors. We have a meeting planned in Ottawa on 28 May with our counterparts in Quebec to talk about this situation. Believe me, we take this as the most urgent situation and challenge to supply management and we are on top of it.

Mr Villeneuve: I am glad to know that the minister is concerned, because we do have producers with lots of room and lots of capacity in their operation, we have very cheap grain here in Ontario that we cannot get rid of, and yet we do not have enough chicken to supply the market and the demand. Quebec processors right now are laughing all the way to the bank by supplying us with Quebec chicken.

Does the minister still stand by his promise to boost Ontario's production and, if he does, how will he do it? He has had the negotiations. How is he going to proceed?

Hon Mr Ramsay: I think I should make it clear for the House that what the honourable member is speaking of, of course, is the Canadian Chicken Marketing Agency in Ottawa that allocates quota and it has allocated quota in a historical allocation that gives Ontario approximately 34.5% of that quota and Quebec 31.5% of that quota. We in Ontario feel that Ontario should have more production here because this is where the consumers are and this is where the processors are. But we are quite willing, as good Canadians, to work with our confrères in the other provinces—I am meeting with them on Monday—and on Friday of this week I will be bringing this matter personally to Mr Mazankowski as he comes to Toronto for an agricultural ministers' meeting.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr Owen: I have a question for the Treasurer. The apparel industry in this province is an important one and employs approximately 35,000 people. Barrie, in my riding, is the site of one of these industries, Caulfeild.

Two years ago, the federal government stated that the tariffs on textiles were too high in this country, that they were undermining the competitiveness of the apparel industry in forcing the consumer to pay more for the final product. It has introduced a plan to spread the tariff reduction over 10 years, but that seems to be having the effect of negating any possibility of reducing the consumer price and at the same time is leading to

serious problems of maintaining these plants in our province. Is the Treasurer aware of this problem and is there anything that can be done to possibly negate the effect this is having on this important sector of our economy?

Hon R. F. Nixon: I certainly am aware of the problem and I congratulate the honourable member on bringing this important matter to the attention of the House. To tell the truth, the same situation prevails in my constituency, where the apparel manufacturing business has actually largely disappeared as a result of the inadequacies of the federal policy.

Mr Owen: The apparel industry here in Ontario finds itself faced with the free trade agreement and its consequences and the changes by way of the rules of GATT and the multi-fibre arrangement. It is one of the few manufacturing industries that will feel the full impact of the pending goods and services tax, since clothing was previously exempt from federal sales tax. In other words, this particular industry is getting the full crush of all sorts of negative programs and policies from the federal government.

Can the provincial government try to get across to the federal government the effect that its policies are going to have on this particular industry and the potential loss of jobs in this particular plant in the city of Barrie?

Hon R. F. Nixon: The industry, of course, has the benefit of the rather progressive, enlightened and in some respects generous policies of the government of Ontario. The honourable member is in a position to bring those to the attention of his constituents. But I would think that the honourable member's question would lead a number of members of the House to contact people at the federal level, particularly the members of the third party in the Legislature, to see if for once the federal initiative might be directed towards protecting our industries instead of allowing their high interest rate policy and the relatively high value of the Canadian dollar to drive them further and further into an economic difficulty which they may find it almost impossible to survive.

LIQUOR LICENCE REVENUES

Mr Farnan: My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. As a minister interested and knowledgeable about the affairs of his ministry, could he please give this House an approximation of the amount of additional revenue that his ministry—

An hon member: He is not there.

Mr Farnan: My apologies, Mr Speaker. I note that the minister is not present at this time. I would refer it to the Treasurer.

Could the Treasurer give this House an estimate of the approximate revenues from increased liquor licence fees during this budget year?

Hon R. F. Nixon: I would be glad to get that information for the honourable member.

Mr Farnan: As a result of regulation 376/89, Peter Tsiokos, the proprietor of Scallion restaurant in Cambridge, has had his liquor licence fee increased 550%, from \$80 for a two-year period to \$450. We must question these types of extraordinary increases imposed not in the budget but by regulation. How can the Treasurer justify such increases, which invariably must be passed on to the consumer? It is an underhanded tax increase and puts the lie to the Treasurer's claim of no tax increases except for tobacco.

1520

Hon R. F. Nixon: The honourable member, as I understand it, is referring to a licence increase which is related to the ability to make a profit. I have not attended the Scallion restaurant, but I can understand that under some circumstances, the restaurant industry and the hospitality industry are suffering from substantial pressure. I am aware of that. I will certainly get the information that the honourable member has requested and see that it is sent to him directly.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I have already added three and a half minutes to the question period.

Interjections.

The Speaker: If the honourable member can place his question in one second, that is fine.

TEACHERS' LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Sterling: Would the Minister of Education tell me what he is doing to get the kids back to school in Ottawa?

Hon Mr Conway: I would refer my honourable friend from Manotick to the answer previously provided to my colleague the member for Ottawa West.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr Sterling from the standing committee on government agencies presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Report on the Ontario Food Terminal Board.

The Speaker: Does the member wish to make a brief statement?

Mr Sterling: Yes, Mr Speaker. It is slightly longer than my question.

This is a report from the standing committee on government agencies dealing with the Ontario Food Terminal Board. The report comprises two parts: the recommendations of the committee plus an attached piece of legislation. I believe this is an important step in the evolution of the powers of the committees of this Legislature.

As members may recall, back in 1988 the member for Waterloo introduced An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act which dealt with the serving of papers on members of this Legislature. In spite of that being a private member's bill, it was called by the government for third and final reading. This is the second piece of legislation that has been introduced by the chairman of the committee, me, on behalf of a committee. It is hoped that the government will treat this kind of legislation in a different manner than it normally treats private members' legislation.

The report recommends the abolition of the monopoly given to the Ontario Food Terminal Board to determine if any competitors should be allowed to operate in York and Peel counties and therefore that sections 12 and 13 of that act be repealed. This recommendation was made in a report by the standing committee on procedural affairs in 1979 and also by the standing committee on government agencies in 1988. This committee feels it is high time that this action now be taken in the form of legislation. Therefore, later today I will be introduc-

ing a bill which will follow the instructions given to me by the committee in this report.

On motion by Mr Sterling, the debate was adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HUMAN RESOURCES PROFESSIONALS ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO ACT, 1990

Mrs Cunningham moved first reading of Bill Pr70, An Act respecting the Human Resources Professionals Association of Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mrs Cunningham moved first reading of Bill 166, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mrs Cunningham: The purpose of the bill is to amend the Highway Traffic Act to require helmets to be worn by bicyclists and by children being carried as passengers on bicycles. The bill would also require that a child being carried on a bicycle be carried in an approved child carrier device. I will be speaking to this important issue at the appropriate time.

ONTARIO FOOD TERMINAL AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Sterling moved first reading of Bill 167, An Act to amend the Ontario Food Terminal Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Sterling: As I said formerly, in the standing orders today, when we were talking about reports of the committee, I am introducing this bill on behalf of the standing committee on government agencies, which gave unanimous consent to the contents of the bill.

The bill takes out sections 12 and 13 of the Ontario Food Terminal Act. It thereby takes away the monopoly that one group of individuals—that board—has in controlling all the wholesale food terminals in York and Peel counties.

I would hope that the government would give this third and final reading and give me the opportunity also to debate it on second reading.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

OPPOSITION DAY JOUR RÉSERVÉ À L'OPPOSITION

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS

Mr Allen: May I have consent, in the absence of Mr Rae, to move the motion that stands in his name on behalf of our party?

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Agreed to.

Mr Allen, on behalf of Mr Rae, moved opposition day motion 3:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Legislative Assembly of Ontario recognizes and affirms that:

this House supports the French Language Services Act;

in the context of our shared belief that linguistic duality is a fundamental characteristic of our country, takes pride in the fact that access for the French-speaking minority in Ontario to the courts, education, public broadcasting, proceedings of the Legislature and provincial services in designated areas has been a shared commitment of different political parties and governments over many years;

the French Language Services Act applies only to the provision of provincial government services to members of the public and can be achieved without diminishing services for the English-speaking majority;

the decision of a municipality to provide municipal services in both English and French is entirely voluntary, and

through public hearings after the spring session, the select committee on the Constitution should in its work seek the views of Ontarians and others on matters relating to the relationship between English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians in Ontario, including services and education.

1530

M. Allen, au nom de M. Rae, propose la motion n° 3 relative au jour de l'opposition.

Que, de l'avis de cette Chambre, l'Assemblée législative reconnaît et affirme que :

elle appuie la Loi sur les services en français ;

témoignant de notre conviction commune à l'effet que la dualité linguistique constitue une caractéristique fondamentale de notre pays, se félicite de ce que la minorité francophone ait accès à des services en français devant les tribunaux, dans les écoles, au niveau de la radiodiffusion publique, au sein de l'Assemblée législative et à d'autres services provinciaux dans les régions désignées, ce qui a traduit l'engagement des trois partis politiques et des différents gouvernements au cours des ans ;

la Loi sur les services en français ne s'applique qu'aux services offerts par le gouvernement au public et ne diminue en rien les services offerts à la majorité anglophone ;

qu'aucune municipalité n'est tenue de fournir des services municipaux en anglais et en français à moins d'une décision prise par ladite municipalité, et ;

lors de ses audiences publiques qu'il tiendra après la session parlementaire du printemps, le Comité spécial sur la constitution devrait inviter les Ontariennes et les Ontariens ainsi que les autres intéressés à venir exprimer leurs opinions sur les questions touchant les relations entre anglophones et francophones en Ontario, y compris dans le domaine des services et de l'éducation.

The Speaker: In the absence of Mr Rae, Mr Allen has moved the motion which you have just heard. I would remind all members that debate will take place for the balance of this sitting. The time will be divided equally among all three parties, and at 5:55 I will ask the House to make a decision on this matter.

Mr Allen: I rise with considerable pride in the place of my leader to introduce the debate in the House this afternoon on this resolution. I will be making a few remarks of introduction and a number of other members of our party who want to take part will be participating in the debate as the afternoon proceeds.

We have had a troubled time in Ontario this spring with regard to the standing, status and place of the French community in Ontario, which numbers 500,000 persons. We have

seen a serious contest with regard to the fundamental principle of the duality of French and English as a basis of our country's existence. We have seen some 50 municipalities move unilingual motions which, in the view of myself and my party, were unnecessary not only because they were an affront to the francophone community in their midst but because they were unnecessary with respect to the reasons given—namely that there was some reason to object to a government insisting that they conduct their proceedings and their affairs in another language. They were not being asked to do that in either instruction or in any legislation that has ever passed this House.

So, as a party, we have wanted to do a few things in this debate this afternoon. We wanted, in the first place, to give the House an opportunity to affirm the legislation which has recently provided a compendium and a set of regulations and guidelines for the provision of French-language services in Ontario.

We have, second, wanted to affirm, and to give this Legislature an opportunity to affirm, the linguistic dualism that rests at the base of our country's existence, and to express our pride as a party in the role that we have played and the role this Legislature has played, through all three parties in this House, in the creation of a growing network of services for the French community in this province.

We have wanted also to provide the House with an opportunity to say, once more, to those who have misunderstood, to those municipalities who have passed resolutions under mistaken impressions or perhaps under other motives, that not only has it not been the intention of this Legislature, not only has it not been the intention of the legislation, but it has not been the content of anything said or done in this House or the content of legislation to require French-language services by municipalities on any basis other than that they make their own decision to provide those services in that way.

Finally, we as a party recommend that since there will be legislative travel by a committee on the Constitution this summer, in all probability, at least according to plans as they exist, that committee should undertake to listen to and to hear reflections and points of view around the relationships of French and English in Ontario so that we may have further helpful advice from the community with regard to both our present and future in that regard.

Il faut insister sur le fait que notre pays est un pays avec un dualisme linguistique. Certaines personnes préfèrent souligner la multiplicité des langues, la multiplicité des cultures de notre pays et ces personnes ont raison. Mais le principe de base de notre pays, le fond de toutes les diversités, de toutes les opportunités multiculturelles de notre pays est le principe de la dualité des Anglais et des Français, la dualité linguistique des deux communautés fondatrices de notre pays.

Il est vrai que, premièrement, il y avaient, au début, les autochtones dans notre pays. De ces autochtones, nous avons reçu le nom de notre pays : le Canada, la cité des peuples. Mais ce sont les Français qui employaient ces termes, «Canada» et «Canadien», avant ma famille, les familles de tous les autres descendants européens et aussi des autres pays.

It is important for us always to emphasize that with all the diversity and the multiculturalism that has come to characterize our country and in spite of the fact, which we recognize, that this continent was inhabited first by aboriginal peoples to whom we have not yet done justice, it is important to recognize that the structures of this nation which provide for the diversity and opportunity of expression from so many groups rests fundamentally upon the first agreements made in the 1770s in this

country that this would be a country that recognized two cultures, recognize two languages as the basis of the rest and what we have had in the future constitutionally in this nation has grown out of that recognition.

At every step that we have made constitutionally the central principle in question which has been in debate, whether it was in the 1770s, whether it was in 1791, whether it was in the 1840s, whether it was in 1867 or whether we came to the great debates around bilingualism or biculturalism in the 1960s, the central question has been to work out sensible relationships between French and English in Canada so that two cultures might thrive in this country.

So this province has taken its own affairs in hand in the course of these last few years, these last 22 years since Mr Roberts in the Confederation of Tomorrow conference proposed a task force which then brought forward certain recommendations for the beginnings of a major network of French-language services. One could spend some time reviewing each of the steps along the way from 1968 forward in which in one area after another, whether in the courts, whether in the domain of education, whether in the provision of social services, whether in the operation of government departments and whether in the arts, this province has developed slowly but surely under a succession of administrations a network of services which begin to look respectable for the francophone community.

It is important to recognize that we do not yet parallel, for example, the 300 primary and secondary schools that the English have at their disposal and control in the province of Quebec, where there are 10 community colleges, three English-speaking universities, totally publicly funded, two English language dailies, 18 weeklies, 11 radio stations, three television stations, and where English language along with French is the official language in all the courts of justice.

We are beginning to approximate and that is the important thing to note. But we want also to insist that just as the federal government, when it established a bilingual regime in the federal civil service and for the country, did not force the hands of the provinces but opened up opportunities for them to provide services, and I repeat, did not force the hand of provinces to provide a bilingual regime in their provinces. In the same way, this provincial Legislature did not intend and has not the intention to force the hands of municipalities. That is another level of government which has its own proper dictates and its own proper authority and its own proper base in democratic election and in democratic procedure. Therefore, it is only proper that they come to their own decisions. This Legislature stands ready to help them in terms of whatever those decisions would be.

1540

The New Democratic Party at every step along the way has been very proud to play a leading role in the proposals it has put forward in this Legislature in order to provide that network of services and to give a status of appropriate respect and standing to the French community in Ontario.

Il faut noter que la Loi sur les services en français ne s'applique qu'aux services offerts par le gouvernement au public et ne diminue en rien les services offerts à la majorité anglophone. Il faut aussi noter qu'aucune municipalité n'est tenue de fournir des services municipaux en anglais et en français à moins d'une décision prise par ladite municipalité.

Our objective, in closing, is quite simply that we desire that all communities that make up this province live with a proper sense of self-respect and with the power to develop and expand

their cultural life. For us, as I said at the beginning, all that diversity of intention and generosity rests upon the principle of dualism, which was the foundation stone of this country as it began building itself in the late years of the 18th century.

Again, I move this motion and I look forward to the rest of the debate in the House this afternoon.

Mr Villeneuve: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity of participating in this very important debate this afternoon.

It is a bit déjà vu, as far as I am concerned, because on 2 April there was a very similar motion that came to the floor of this Legislature. For whatever reason, the official opposition and the government did not see fit to support that particular legislation. It was brought forward by our party, and I want to put it on the record just so that everyone realizes that we may have some repetition this afternoon, but I am told that we will have a change of opinion on behalf of both the official opposition and the government.

The former debate and the former motion came from the then leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the interim leader, my friend and colleague the member for Sarnia. It read as follows:

"That, in the opinion of this House, while reaffirming its support for the provision of French-language services where numbers warrant, while confirming that the French Language Services Act, 1986, was not intended to apply to municipalities, recognizes the elevated tensions and misunderstandings which have developed over language issues throughout this province, and therefore calls upon the government of Ontario to establish, as soon as possible, an all-party committee of the Legislature to travel across the province to receive public input on the administrative guidelines, regulations and implementation of the French Language Services Act, 1986."

That was debated on 2 April. What we have today is a motion to bring a number of things together, including the mixing of the language problem here in the province of Ontario with some constitutional reforms. This constitutional committee was originally set up in 1987. The constitutional committee has been in place ever since then, was mandated to look into the Meech Lake accord and is presently looking into Senate reform. There is nothing wrong with that. However, the bringing in of this particular motion and broadening, I guess, the mandate of the constitutional committee tends to bring in all sorts of mixed signals. I will give you some examples, Mr Speaker, because it concerns me very much. I am afraid there are some political games being played.

Mr Kerrio: Yes, but are there?

Mr Villeneuve: I am afraid there are. The member for Niagara Falls says, "Are there?" I am here to tell him that there are. I would not think he is so naïve as to think that our initial resolution did not bring forth this resolution, and I believe we have a government that is now saying: "Boy, we told the people we are open and, all of a sudden, we voted against democracy. We voted against having input into the situation."

I believe their cousins over here in the official opposition saw the same thing, so they said, "Well, you know, the Tories brought in a good resolution here and, all of a sudden, I believe maybe we should. We have some remorse. Our conscience is now bothering us, so how do we get out of this? How do we get the monkey off the Premier's back on this one? We'll get someone to bring it forth and bring it to an existing committee of the Legislature, the select committee on constitutional and inter-governmental affairs."

When you talk of the constitutional committee it brings forth thoughts of what is happening in our sister province in Quebec. I am not any happier than most of the people in this Legislature about Bill 101 and about Bill 78, but do you know what it is going to do, Mr Speaker? It is all going to precipitate this into this very debate. I do not like the sign language law in Quebec any more than most people here in Ontario. I do not like it at all. Bill 101 has some very severe limitations, but bringing this to a constitutional committee says, "Boy, we involve all of this."

I represent a riding along the Ontario-Quebec border. We have individuals who are very unhappy with the way the laws apply to residents of Ontario attempting to work in the province of Quebec, and vice versa, where the residents of the province of Quebec come into Ontario and they are able to work. I have, on a number of occasions, brought this to the attention of the legislative assembly of the province of Quebec. They tell me it has to do with unions and they have 17 regions in the province of Quebec where one union cannot cross those artificial boundaries. Of course, Ontario becomes the 18th so-called region where the people who work, the workers, cannot cross. Try to explain that.

But bringing this particular matter to a constitutional committee brings all of those things into play and it is rather sad. Presently, the constitutional committee studying Senate reform has a lot of items it must address in that particular area. I will bring forth a few examples that I had right in my riding. I also wrote a letter to the Premier, away back in October 1987, requesting that a specific committee, in 1987, be set up to look into the implementation of Bill 8 because at that time there was a lot of misunderstanding. The government had not done a good job in setting forth exactly what was going to be happening as the implementation of Bill 8 unfolded.

Indeed, we had some situations that were not quite right and I am pleased to have been part of solving one of the problems: looking for an agricultural representative for the county of Glengarry. The requirements, prior to my meeting with some representatives of the Premier back in February 1990, were "advanced oral and superior written French-language skills to Ontario government standards and a good command of English."

I spoke to many people, both French- and English-speaking, in the riding that I very proudly represent, and they did not think that was fair. Indeed, there was an admission by the Premier's office that it was misleading and it was indeed not fair. That has been changed to "good command of both French and English," and that is the way it should be.

That particular position has just been allocated to a gentleman who I think is very worthy, but under the old system he may not have qualified. Glen Slater is now the new agricultural representative in Glengarry county. I believe it is very important that this requirement was changed because Glen Slater may not have qualified under the former requirements for bilinguals.

It is interesting that we have only eight Liberal members, eight government members, sitting in the Legislature today in a very important debate, a debate that I believe will be historic, because they may well be setting up a mandated committee, a constitutional committee that will indeed look into what I was asking for more than three years ago. The problem is they are doing it after having turned down our request and having some feelings of remorse. It is somewhat deceiving to the public when these things occur. It leaves one wondering just where the government is.

1550

Indeed, as we get close to an election, they are looking for a way out of this one so that they can say, "Yes, we have had some input." I am pleased to have taken the initiative three years ago to have requested it, but I did not want to mix it up in constitutional situations that would pit French against English. I am afraid that the way the government has set this one up, the way it is intending to set this one up, will bring in the entire constitutional situation of Meech Lake, the things that we do not like that are happening in Quebec, and we will have many, many people talking about this and polarizing more.

If I would have brought to this committee, which existed back in January and February 1990 when we had the problem with advertising for a bilingual agricultural representative—that committee was in place but it was not mandated to do this, so I had to look for someone who had some authority. I had to look for someone who was going to be able to tell the Premier, "This is not right and this is not fair." I was fortunate to be able to find someone.

Je me fais un plaisir de participer aux débats, mais je trouve la situation très compliquée en autant que nous avons une résolution ici du Nouveau Parti démocratique qui est pratiquement identique à celle que nous avons proposée à l'Assemblée législative le 2 avril et qui a été refusée, non seulement par le gouvernement, mais aussi par les néo-démocrates.

Le comité en question, le Comité spécial sur la constitution, existait à ce moment-là. Le Comité aurait pu avoir un mandat il y a déjà longtemps pour jeter un coup d'oeil sur la mise en oeuvre du projet de loi 8, aurait pu corriger nombre de choses qui ont créé des situations où les municipalités se sont déclarées unilingues anglaises. C'est dommage. Le dommage est pratiquement déjà fait, mais par contre un comité pourrait le corriger.

Le problème avec le Comité est que c'est un comité sur la constitution, un comité constitutionnel qui va mélanger l'accord du Lac Meech, la réforme du sénat et les problèmes qui se passent au Québec. Ça va emmener la chose complètement à une situation de polarisation entre francophones et anglophones et je vous assure, Monsieur le Président, que c'est la dernière chose dont nous avons besoin.

Alors, pour résumer, ça me fait plaisir de participer mais, par contre, je vois avec difficulté pouvoir appuyer telle résolution quand la même résolution aurait pu être débattue par les députés de l'Assemblée législative il y a déjà trois ans.

Alors, pour terminer, nous avions déjà le comité en place, comité qui n'avait pas le mandat de faire autre chose que d'étudier la réforme constitutionnelle.

In closing, I appreciate the fact that someone has had some remorse here. Someone has decided that, "Yes, we had better, before we go to the electorate, correct the fact that there was no public input into this very important factor of providing minority language services which we support." It is always nice to see some people having some remorse. However, I believe the confusion that will follow will be more negative than positive.

Mr Adams: In terms of the two official languages of Canada, I think we often forget that there are only two substantial minorities in the country. One of those, of course, is in the province of Quebec, the English-speaking part of the population of the province of Quebec. The other is the francophone population of our own province, the province of Ontario.

When we think about those two minorities, I think very often we get the impression that there is a very large group in

Quebec and a relatively small group in Ontario, whereas the reality is that the numbers in Quebec, as I recall, are in the order of 700,000 English-speaking Québécois, and here in Ontario we have 500,000 French-speaking Ontarians—500,000 versus 700,000. It is not a very great difference. They are in the same ballpark.

It is interesting to look at those two minority groups and compare them, for example, socially. The anglophones in Quebec, in terms of income, are typically above the average for the province. In terms of unemployment, they are typically below the average in the province. In terms of education, just to give one example, they are 30% more likely to go to college or university than the French-speaking citizens of the province of Quebec.

What are the equivalent measures here in Ontario? Typically, the income of our francophone population, the 500,000 French-speaking citizens we have, is below the average for the province. Typically, they have above-average unemployment. I saw a figure recently that suggested they had double the illiteracy of the general population of the province of Ontario and, generally speaking, there are more of our Franco-Ontarians supported by the social assistance programs than the average for the province as a whole.

Here we are in the richest province of Confederation, in the province which takes pride in its role in Confederation, and I wonder if we can be proud of the difference between our 500,000 and the 700,000 anglophones in the province of Quebec. When I saw these differences, I wondered what sort of support the two minorities were receiving, the anglophones in Quebec and the francophones here in Ontario.

The member for Hamilton West mentioned this. Let's just take the university level alone. In the province of Quebec there are three anglophone English-speaking universities. There is Concordia University, McGill University in Montreal and Bishop's University in Lennoxville.

McGill University can only be compared with the University of Toronto here in Ontario. I read recently in the Toronto Star that McGill University is one of the most popular universities for Metropolitan Toronto students. Large numbers of students go from Metro to McGill to be educated, and these are anglophone students going to an English-speaking university.

Those universities have lower tuition fees than our own. Who supports those English-speaking universities in Quebec? The answer, of course, is the same as here. Those universities are supported by the taxpayers of Quebec, and we are talking of \$300 million a year in Quebec paid by Quebec taxpayers for those three universities alone.

If we go beyond that, I mentioned that English-speaking Quebecers are 30% more likely to go to college or university than their French-speaking confrères. They have—I thought seven, but my colleague the member for Hamilton West said, I believe, 10 anglophone English-speaking colleges. They have many school boards.

In terms of access to provincial government services, what do they have there? As I discovered when I was in the Lac-Saint-Jean region quite recently, they have access to services in English virtually everywhere. When I was in Lac-Saint-Jean for a visit, less than 1% of the population had English as its first language, and they have access to government services in English. There were letters in the local newspapers criticizing M. Bourassa for providing services in an area where there were so few anglophones.

1600

That brings me to Bill 8 which is one of the topics addressed by the resolution today. Bill 8, as you know, Mr Speaker, provides access to services in French to Franco-Ontarians. What does this bill, which has caused a certain amount of controversy in various parts of the province, really provide? As I said, it is access to services in French for our French-speaking fellow Ontarians.

These services are available not everywhere, but where at least 10 per cent—that is 10 out of every 100—of the people in the region have French as their first language. So in these areas where numbers warrant, citizens can obtain services in their own language, one of the two national languages of Canada, from the government of Ontario. This is also available in localities where there is a minimum concentration of at least 5,000 French-speaking citizens.

It seems to me that for the greatest province in Canada, with the largest minority of francophone citizens, this is a modest gesture that we are making towards our fellow Ontarians, 83% of whom, by the way, live in such regions, that is to say, regions with more than 10% francophones or a concentration of more than 5,000.

Recently, as both previous speakers mentioned, a number of our municipalities have made a point, for reasons of their own, of passing resolutions declaring themselves unilingual English. The language of administration of Ontario is English. There is no reason for anyone to pass any sort of a unilingual English resolution. What is more, in Bill 8 the municipalities are specifically exempt. Why should Ontario interfere with the autonomy of our municipalities? They may of course, if they wish, pass a resolution to offer their municipal services in French but if they do not wish to do so, they need not.

There has been a good deal of talk about the sign law in the province of Quebec, which allows for French signs outside and English signs inside. I have to say, and I agree with one of the previous speakers, that I deplore that sign law. It smacks to me of petty politics, of a lack of vision of the dual-language nature of Canada, and I am sorry to see Quebec, albeit a province which I believe does provide well for its anglophone citizens, pass such a law. But I put that sign law in Quebec at the same level of dirty, crass politics as these unilingual English resolutions in municipalities around Ontario.

When we are thinking about Bill 8 and we have these concerns about it, another thing that often arises is the cost. To be honest, I do not know the full cost of the colleges, school boards, hospitals and so on that operate in the province of Quebec in English. I do not know that but I mention to members the one figure I know. For their three universities alone which are English speaking—and we have no French universities in Ontario; we have a couple of bilingual institutions—\$300 million every year is paid by the Quebec taxpayer.

Here we have a bill which apparently costs in the order of \$15 million or \$20 million a year. As you know, Mr Speaker, in this province \$10 million a year is roughly \$1 per head per year. So for this bill which provides services to our French-speaking compatriots here in Ontario and allows us to give a signal to the rest of Canada that Ontario is prepared to play a lead in Confederation, the cost of this bill is literally a few dollars per person per year. For that we address the needs of 500,000 people in Ontario who are generally below average by many of the measures that we use, and we show that the province of Ontario believes in Confederation and believes in the dual-language nature of Canada.

There are some who say that one of the concerns with Bill 8 is loss of jobs by the anglophone community. In Ontario, as a result of this bill, we are looking at 7% of the positions in the provincial service which will be bilingual—bilingual, not francophone. We have at this point in time, preparing to take such jobs with the children of our francophone Ontarian friends, over 100,000 anglophone children in French immersion schools in the province of Ontario today to take the 7%. Is 7% of the jobs in our public service for 5% of the population which is francophone too much?

I feel that Ontario, which has the largest French-speaking population outside the province of Quebec, has a duty to protect the language rights of its French-speaking minority community. I believe that by providing provincial government services in French we are doing the right thing in the spirit of generosity, fairness and accommodation that has always characterized this province and its role in Confederation.

Monsieur le Président, en tant que député de la circonscription de Peterborough, c'était un plaisir de vous parler aujourd'hui. Je suis fier de dire que je suis pour la Loi 8 et pour cette résolution.

I will be voting in favour of the resolution.

Mr Laughren: I am very pleased to take part in this debate this afternoon. I consider it to be one of those debates that will be regarded as a milestone in this Parliament and perhaps in other parliaments as well.

I do not like starting off the debate on somewhat of a sour note, but I am appalled at the fact that the Premier is not here this afternoon. We named the Premier as the minister to whom this resolution was directed, and it was another example, if I could be blunt about it, of his appalling lack of leadership on this issue. I think that the least he could have done was to have been here this afternoon.

I am also surprised at the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry in his comment that he is going to be voting against this resolution. He used as one of his arguments that it is almost the same as the one that his party had a month or so ago. If it is almost the same as the one they had a month or so ago, I fail to understand why he and his colleagues would not now be supporting this resolution. The difference between that resolution and this one is that this one is somewhat broader in its application.

There has been much to-do about the provision of government services in the French language in Ontario. We know that the francophone community constitutes about 5% of the population, but of course in communities such as the one I represent, north and west of Sudbury, it is much higher than that. My own constituency must have about 30% to 35% francophone in the population.

Bill 8, which has caused a lot of the furore, was passed in November 1986 and was given a three-year phase-in period so people could get used to it and to allow the provincial institutions to adapt to its requirements. It was passed unanimously back in 1986 so one does wonder why this resolution is necessary this afternoon, but I feel very strongly that indeed it is absolutely necessary.

The opening sentence in our resolution states that "this House supports the French Language Services Act," and since the House supported the bill unanimously in 1986, I was hoping that we would get unanimous support for this resolution this afternoon. It appears now that will not be the case, and I regret that very much.

1610

It seems to me that we need to remind ourselves and others from time to time that we are consistent and firm in our defence of certain basic principles, and that is how I view Bill 8. One of those principles is the recognition that linguistic duality is a fundamental characteristic of this country and of this province. Ontario has a proud history of this recognition and, quite frankly, all three political parties have played a major and a positive role in reaching out to our francophone citizens, and that surely is as it should be.

On a personal note, I was born in Quebec. I was raised and educated in Ontario, and I have worked in Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Manitoba and now, of course, here in Ontario. I have always felt that there were a couple of characteristics about this country that set us apart and gave us a unique identity in the North American context. Those two characteristics, for me at least, are our linguistic duality and our generosity as a people. Our linguistic duality cannot be denied. Quebec is primarily a French-speaking province, in contrast to all the other provinces.

Our generosity, I believe, can be questioned but surely not categorically denied. We have pioneered, in North America, medicare. We have both the non-contributory old age pension and the contributory Canada pension plan. We believe in a social safety net to protect not only ourselves as individuals but our fellow citizens who may not be as fortunate as we. I believe that Ontario, as Canada's most affluent province, must show the way both in protecting the rights of our linguistic minority and in our generosity to all citizens.

In case there are those who want to turn their backs on the linguistic duality of Canada because of a particularly offensive piece of Quebec legislation known as Bill 78, commonly known as the sign law, I should remind members of a couple of facts. In the provision of education to anglophones in Quebec, there is a provision for the complete education in English from kindergarten to university, and anglophones themselves control their own school system and school boards.

At the college level, keeping in mind that there are about half a million French-speaking citizens in Ontario—in Quebec there are a few more than that; about 600,000 anglophones, I believe—there is only one French-language college, and even that just recently, while in Quebec there are—there is a dispute on numbers here. The last time I checked there were seven English-language colleges in the province of Quebec. In Ontario at the university level, there is no French-language university, while there are three English-language universities in the province of Quebec.

In the provision of health care services in Ontario under Bill 8, more health care services will be provided in French, particularly in the 22 designated areas. It should be pointed out that in Quebec under Bill 142, every English-speaking person is entitled to receive health care and social services in the English language anywhere in the province.

I realize, of course, that statistics and laws do not a nation make. I know, as well, that we cannot legislate generosity of spirit. We can legislate the provision of services, we can legislate equal treatment under the law, we can try to acknowledge the distinct nature of Quebec society under the Meech Lake accord. We can, if we choose, designate Ontario as officially bilingual. We can demonstrate all the goodwill in the world, but in the end the legislation can only provide leadership. I suspect that when the national anthem of this country, which is the national anthem of Quebec as well, is booed at major events, it does more harm to the unity of this country than any bad legis-

lation coming out of Quebec or even any English-only resolutions that come out of Ontario.

As legislators, all we can do is provide the leadership, and we simply must lead in the demand for both more tolerance and understanding. We must lead our lives as public people so that we become not lightning-rods but beacons of hope for those who desperately want to simply retain and promote their heritage.

In conclusion, the last part of the resolution calls for the establishment of a select committee on the Constitution. Contrary to what the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry said, I believe that aspect is a terribly important part of this resolution. One of the complaints I get from my constituents—and, quite frankly, where I live is, from time to time, a hotbed of the French-language dispute on the provision of services to the French-language community—is the appearance that this bill was put in place in the dead of night. It is not true, of course. It was passed in 1986 and had a three-year phase-in period, but I will say this: There has been a lack of leadership on the part of the government to get information out to the municipalities and to the public at large. I think that low-bridging strategy was a mistake and I hope that has sunk in to the minister and to the Premier, although the absence of the Premier does not speak well to my concerns this afternoon.

I think it is terribly important that we have an all-party committee, that the all-party committee will travel the province, that the all-party committee will invite people so that there will be a balanced presentation to the committee and both sides of the issue will be heard. If people do not want this committee to travel and hold public hearings, I would ask them why. Why do we not want this committee to travel and hear representation from the people of the different parts of Ontario who are concerned about not just Bill 8 but the provision of education services as well?

I would ask my friends in the Conservative caucus to reconsider, because I think it is ill-advised on their part to vote against a resolution that simply reaffirms what we have already affirmed back three years ago, almost four years ago, and not only affirmed it but then said, “We feel so good about it we want to take this across the province”—not just Bill 8, because I think that is too narrow, but also the provision of social services and education to our French-speaking citizens in the province.

I feel very strongly that this is the proper route to go, and I look forward to as many—I really was hoping that all members of this assembly, in the spirit of the way in which the resolution was intended, would demonstrate to all of Ontario that we are concerned about the divisiveness that has occurred in some of our communities and that our job as legislators is to heal those rifts and get on with building and improving upon what I think has been a generous province.

Mrs Cunningham: I would like to bring to this debate this afternoon some of the experiences of citizens across Ontario as I have heard them in the last few weeks and months. We do, in fact, have an issue in our province, one that we are not all proud of. That is the confusion around what French-language services in the province of Ontario really mean.

I would like to have this opportunity to tell members what they mean for myself and for the Conservative Party of Ontario. We believe very strongly in the extension of French-language services in this province where numbers warrant; we believe in an implementation that is fair, that is handled carefully, and we believe in programs that are not only needed but are warranted because the public is saying, “That makes good sense and that’s what we support.” In Ontario today, I can tell members after

having travelled, that is not happening. As a matter of fact, because of an implementation that is not careful, because of a bill that has not been well explained, because of a bill that has a couple of regulations that do not mean anything to the public, because there truly are no clear guidelines, we have in Ontario, for the very first time, a public that is angry.

I listened to my colleagues in the House this afternoon as they talked about English-only resolutions, about which we are all concerned. I listened to my colleagues in the House this afternoon as they talked about travelling across the province themselves and understanding what was going on. If they were truly listening, they would understand this: The only concern out there is the implementation of Bill 8 right now.

1620

The second concern has to do with the Education Act, which is being discussed by school boards across this province in the rightful medium, with their administration, their school boards and the public. That is being discussed right now, and at the appropriate time, I feel that they will bring their concerns to this House. But right now it is our responsibility to deal with what we know about, and that is the lack of a clear implementation of Bill 8.

Having said that, I would like to speak to what is happening this afternoon in this House, and I will say this with some degree, I am sure, of passion, in that I really am quite disappointed in the process this afternoon. Everyone who has spoken so far has asked us to support a committee that would go across this province to hear the concerns of the public. I think we should be listening to the concerns of the public as they have been put to us in our constituency offices and in this House.

I know that there will be members who will want to take this opportunity to deal with maybe the second and third concerns. Those are, of course, the Education Act and how it is applied to school boards now in about the third year of implementation, just as we are seeing some problems.

But I think the very first concern is the French-language services and whether or not we should have signs on highways and where they should be; whether or not we should have signs in hospitals; whether it is appropriate across the province or otherwise; to what extent we should have bilingual civil servants, in all ministries or any ministries. That is what I heard and that is what I think we should be dealing with first.

I am disappointed this afternoon, because we put forth that resolution just a few weeks ago. We very clearly dealt with the issue, and that was the implementation of Bill 8. The public is confused enough around what the real issues in the extension of French-language services are. They are confused enough about whether or not we are talking about the Education Act and the implementation of French-language education services. And they are confused about whether we are talking about the Meech Lake accord.

We had a wonderful opportunity a few weeks ago to deal with the issue, the implementation of a bill that has no guidelines, which the public is not clear about. There is confusion as to who is paying for it, and the cost, in fact, has gone up in the last four years from some \$8.7 million to a projection of over \$40 million. That may not be a lot of money in some people’s views, but when you are not getting dollars for programs that municipalities and school boards think are more important, I think that was a wonderful opportunity to clarify it. If the members of the official opposition and if members of the government wanted that opportunity to make it very clear, they had that opportunity.

Now, in fact, as my colleague the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry pointed out, they are not dealing with Bill 8, which is the issue for this province in the next election. That is the issue.

[Laughter]

Mrs Cunningham: They are muddying it up. I have travelled. They can laugh all they like; they are muddying it up.

Mr Kerrio: Mike came in on a high note; it did not take long.

Mrs Cunningham: Forget it. This was exactly the same position our party had two years ago when the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry asked for a committee before this House, and we did it again three weeks ago. We asked to travel; we asked to be specific. Right now that is not what this motion is all about. It is in fact confusing an already confused public, and I think we have a more important responsibility to them than that.

If, in fact, the members of this House are interested in implementing a very controversial piece of legislation, brick by brick, row by row, so that the public buys into it, this committee will not do that. It does not even say the committee is going to travel.

I am going to close on this note right now because I think it is very important. This resolution this afternoon will pass, but this House had a very much better opportunity to deal with the real issue. It chose not to. One of the reasons I ran for this Legislative Assembly was to bring to this House the issues of the public, and that is what I am doing right now.

Having said all of that, I can only say that I will not support this resolution. I will not support it for two reasons. It is only meant to confuse the public. What we really need are clear guidelines so that this bill can be implemented through resolutions and through guidelines that are clearly established, and right now we have an implementation by bureaucracy with no direction. I think it is sad that we had the opportunity three weeks ago. I did not get myself elected so that I could come down here and watch these little games in the Legislative Assembly.

This is only an issue of wording. We put our position clearly, and it still remains the same. We want a careful implementation of the bill, and these are just little games. They are everything I do not stand for. They are one of the reasons I ran for this House. They are little boy games and I do not want to be part of them.

Ms Oddie Munro: I am very pleased to be able to enter into the debate, and I should say at the outset that I do support the resolution. I do intend to work on a continuous basis with the minister and with the government and with all members of the Legislature to ensure that this bill is fully understood and is implemented and enjoyed to the benefit of all Ontarians.

I would like to begin my remarks by taking a look at where I come from, the riding of Hamilton Centre. Hamilton Centre is a diverse community of peoples from all walks of life, from many countries in the world, representing many cultures, languages and customs. Hamilton's francophone community has contributed significantly to the development and heritage of Hamilton and region from pre-founding days to current times. Many cultural groups have indeed immigrated to Hamilton, and we all live side by side. Certainly the city and the region have benefited from the rich blend of background contributions and commitments.

Even to the casual observer, it is obvious that Hamilton's people are interested in and demand effective communication on legislation, policies and programs of this government. In fact, issues have traditionally been raised and must continue to be discussed on the floor of this Legislature by MPPs, and Bill 8, the French Language Services Act, is no exception.

The purpose of Bill 8 is to provide government services to the French-speaking minority in Ontario through each one of our ministries, agencies, boards and commissions, not only in the centre of government in Toronto but also out in local communities.

Provision of services to Ontario's francophones means that this important founding group can access information and services in its own language, a service not enjoyed prior to 1986. It does not diminish services to the English-speaking majority nor the multicultural services provided or planned by various government ministries to multicultural communities in keeping with this government's multicultural policy introduced in 1987.

The bill, in fact, complements. It does not create the legitimacy of the francophone community. It complements, in fact, what already exists. It complements the many voluntary activities in francophone and local communities, in education, social affairs, culture, drama and professional networking.

The passing of Bill 8, the French Language Services Act, in 1986 was welcomed in this Legislature by all parties. It was welcomed across the province. Hamilton was only one of a number of communities officially recognizing the historic, economic and social importance of this legislation.

The three-year implementation leading to the act being in full force in 1989 was well known to everyone. In fact, the process issue was raised from time to time in this Legislature; for example, during question period, in estimates, in the budget. Indeed, the Ontario French Language Services Commission issued annual reports detailing progress over the three years in which it was empowered to prepare and work carefully with government agencies and communities to assist in fully implementing the bill in 1989.

What a surprise, and an unwelcome one, to witness the negative reaction of some communities after the bill was fully implemented. The actions of municipalities is indeed a case in point. We all recognize that there are complex reasons put forward by each municipal council in each community and many attempts to avoid the damaging effects of negative resolutions, and in fact this resolution we are debating today is one of these. We must all work together to make sure that the bill works, and certainly public participation is one avenue. Each one of us, in his or her own way, has to ask what we could have done better to communicate with people in our own ridings and what we can do better to allay suspicion, concerns and fears so we can all celebrate the fact that the francophone community in Ontario can now access government services not provided heretofore.

1630

It is not a partisan issue; indeed, I have heard MPPs of all political stripes argue in favour of Bill 8, in response to concerns surfacing in communities since its implementation. I am sure each of us has seen many concerns laid to rest when we have taken the time to talk at first hand with people or taken time to answer letters and send concerns to the minister responsible for francophone affairs. The burden of responsibility for ensuring that everyone understands the bill is a very real one, and it is ours.

How did I as a member respond to the needs for information in my community? Probably not well enough, but I intend

to continue to do that. I have answered letters, as other members have. I have answered phone calls and I have passed those phone calls and messages on. I have held breakfast club meetings to try to get information to professional people, to French-language groups and to students. Indeed, I have invited not only the francophone groups, but also the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada groups and various other groups which wished to be heard, wished to understand, wished to debate with everyone present.

An instance stands out in my mind where I had a town hall meeting in one of the local high schools. The member for Hamilton West attended that meeting, as did the minister responsible for francophone affairs. I can tell members that when we all get together and talk about issues and see each other's eyes and realize that we all have the same red blood which can bleed over issues like this, then understanding starts to happen. I should tell members that the minister was on his feet for over three hours talking to a variety of people who came up, some of them very gingerly, to the microphones to ask things that they have never thought of asking before, and he answered their questions. I saw groups that were willing to then start talking to each other because they had been forced to take a stand of confrontation with each other.

Communication can work, and I think what is happening in this House today is we are saying, "We had good intentions as a government, we will continue to go across the province and we need, each one of us as a member in this Legislature, to make it work." I am supporting the resolution and I know that it will work. All of us must consider how we communicate and how we are playing a role to make sure that the burden of this legislation does not once again fall on the backs of the Franco-Ontarians and, indeed, all other citizens. I would like to take a look at the history of this province, because I think it is through the history that we can see where we are heading in this bill.

A basic aspect of our character as a nation and as a province is a diversity of this population in Ontario. Canada and Ontario are truly a community of communities. When European traders and missionaries first arrived in the New World they encountered over 50 distinct Inuit and native cultures. The contributions of our aboriginal groups are an important part of Canada and Ontario's rich historical and cultural heritage which we must not forget.

The English and French languages are also fundamental characteristics of Canada's identity as a nation. As founding groups, they both occupy a special place in the evolution of this country and this province. The French presence in Ontario dates back some 350 years to the arrival of the first European settlers. Over the years the French-speaking community has made many contributions to Ontario's historical, linguistic and cultural heritage. The subsequent arrival of settlers from other parts of Europe and the world has equally enriched the social fabric of this province.

The multicultural reality of Ontario society spans both founding language groups. English-speaking Ontarians represent numerous and diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Each group has made significant contributions to the cultural mosaic of our society and will continue so to do. Over the years, Ontario's French-speaking community has been equally enriched by the arrival of newcomers from various French-speaking nations around the world. I believe that what distinguishes our society from others is our desire, individually and collectively, to preserve and promote our cultural diversity within the broader bilingual character of our country.

Canada's linguistic duality is a historical fact. It is a reality and it must continue to be a reality. Abroad, Canada's bilingualism is what defines its uniqueness as a nation. Newcomers know that French and English are the official languages of this country. As Ontarians and Canadians, we should take pride in our national identity, we should appreciate what distinguishes us from others and, most important, we should fight to protect our heritage wherever and whenever it is threatened.

The recent actions of a number of municipalities passing unilingual English resolutions is one such threat. To me, the exclusion of one segment of this population, and the founders of this province at that, is a rejection of the very values that Ontario stands for; namely, tolerance, generosity and fairness. If this is the type of respect shown to a founding group, then what can other language groups expect to receive? Various ethnic groups have shown tremendous support for the government's French-language services policy; indeed, many multicultural groups openly criticize the actions of municipalities passing unilingual English resolutions.

Ontario is home to 500,000 francophones, the largest number of French-speaking citizens outside the province of Quebec. As such, it has a responsibility to meet the needs of this population. The French Language Services Act attempts to address this need, and we must all make it work together. We must all try very hard.

The provision of French-language services is not new to this province. For over 20 years, successive Ontario governments have moved to increase French-language services to the public. What the French Language Services Act does, I repeat, is it consolidates existing policy in a provincial statute, giving Ontarians the right to receive provincial government services in French. It recognizes the contributions Ontario's French-speaking citizens have made to this province's historical cultural and linguistic heritage, and in the national context Ontario's French-language policies can be viewed as this province's contribution to the vision of a bilingual and multicultural nation. The provision of provincial government services in French enables all French-speaking Ontarians, including members of Ontario's French-speaking multicultural communities, to participate fully in Ontario society.

It is important to understand that the Ontario government's provision of French-language services neither limits nor reduces the provision of English-language services or the rights of English-speaking Ontarians. English remains the language of administration for the Ontario government. Nor does the legislation infringe on the rights of other linguistic and ethnic groups.

Over the years, we have been further enriched by the vibrant contributions of numerous multicultural groups. Although we are different in our own ways, a common thread binds us together, and that is our understanding for, and appreciation of, each other's differences. Affirming our national identity does not take anything away from our recognition of and appreciation for the multicultural reality of our society. We consider the presence of peoples with diverse cultural backgrounds to be a source of enrichment and strength. This is reflected in our government's multiculturalism strategy, which provides Ontarians with public services and programs that are sensitive and responsive to cultural traditions and values.

Surely it makes sense not to deprive our province's own founding French community of the same respect and generosity we want for ourselves and for our own children. French-language services must be seen as an enhancement of the delivery of government services to the public. It is in keeping, certainly,

with this government's tradition of providing services that are responsive to local communities and to individuals.

I would like finally, in closing, to support once again the resolution and to join with my colleagues of the House in saying that I am part of the team, I am part of this Legislature, I also was elected to respond to the needs of people in Ontario. I am very, very pleased to support the resolution of the Leader of the Opposition and to support the government and to support the minister responsible for francophone affairs.

1640

Mr R. F. Johnston: I stand today to support this resolution, but with some sadness and regret that it has to come forward to this House as an opposition day resolution rather than as a three-party consensus. I regret that because I hate to lose any day to savage the government that is provided us under the standing orders. I regret it because the three parties and the three leaders were not able to come to the position of reinforcing our belief in the two founding nations in this province. I regret it because I listened to Tory members speak and was mildly outraged by the notion that this is gamesmanship when one recalls how the Tory motion came before this House, shortly after a leaders' meeting in which a joint resolution was discussed with no idea that this kind of negative resolution around Bill 8 would be introduced.

Then to attack us today for bringing forward, yes, a negative resolution. I remind members to read, especially perhaps the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry in that party, the wording of that resolution, which was very negatively put, around the implementation of Bill 8. Instead, today we have before us a very positive reaffirmation of some of the values that are intrinsic to this society of ours in Ontario and to this country of ours. To have the Tories claim gamesmanship and then say they are not going to support this because it is too general or something is a pathetic pandering to a minority group in this province which does not deserve the pandering it is receiving.

I remember, a number of years ago, when as the critic for Community and Social Services I realized, for the first time in my life, that young kids with mental health problems in northern Ontario were going to Quebec for services. I remember learning that kids from Timmins and Kapuskasing who had mental health problems all were going over to la Maison Rouyn in Quebec. Some still do. I was shocked at that fact, that we could not provide services in French to people who needed them in times of psychological turmoil, especially young people in our society. As a result, I think many governments have tried over the years to move towards providing greater services for our French Canadian community in Ontario. I am happy to associate myself with those kinds of changes.

We need to get at the wider contextual roots of the malaise around Bill 8, because the concerns of anybody you talk to about Bill 8—and I do not know who the Tories are talking to; maybe it is a group of Tories in Ontario they are talking to—are not specifically with Bill 8. There are fears about the implications of Bill 8, there are fears about the growing erosion of the majority's rights, as they see it, fears which need to be dealt with directly.

In my view, the kind of statement we are talking about here, about public hearings this summer to discuss our values as a province, around the role of our two founding nations in this province, to discuss some of the very real problems we are going to face in terms of, for instance, the governance of our education system, very real ones which must be confronted by

this government and by this Legislature, as a result especially of the recent Alberta Supreme Court ruling, we need to have the public involved in those kinds of discussions.

I can only say that I was delighted by the work that my leader did in pulling together this kind of resolution, in hoping to find consensus among the leaders first to bring it in in that kind of format. Given the importance of what we are talking about here today, I am disappointed frankly that the Premier is not in his seat. If he could be here for question period, for the induction of the new leader of the Progressive Conservative Party here today, then I think he should have made this a priority as well, if he believes in the need for this statement of reaffirmation today, as I sense most members on the other side do.

I stand firmly in favour of this resolution as a reaffirmation of the rights of our francophone community and of the need to have discussions around the many complex questions that are arising, whether around services and municipalities or services through the Ministry of Education that should be expected by our minorities and how we can best deal with those in the province. I hope all members of this Legislature will see fit to come to an understanding of how important it is, at this stage in our history, to put away some mild partisan advantage that might be seen to be there in terms of pandering to lower expectations in our province than those which most of us in this House hold and that we will all vote together in a unanimous fashion in support of this resolution and then get the message out to the people of Ontario that the view of Ontario that is within this very positive statement is the view we all share.

Mr Cousens: I would like first of all to thank the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry for his remarks today. We are very fortunate to have such a person in that riding, who has such an insight into the needs that really go on in our province, who comes from a community in which there is a strong community of French-speaking people and also people who come from other backgrounds.

This issue before the House today is one of those major and important issues that we as a Legislature really have to deal with honestly and openly. There have been an awful lot of attempts over a period of time to try to have that kind of open debate. I felt that was part and parcel of the resolution the member for Sarnia brought forward on opposition day, and other members of this House saw fit not to support it.

Included in his motion is one point that I want to say, and say again, because some people would like to put other words in my mouth that are not there. He said, "by reaffirming our support for the provision of French-language services where numbers warrant, while confirming the French Language Services Act." The moment someone says that anyone in this province does not want to support the services where numbers warrant, does not want to support the intention behind the French Language Services Act, when you start to think that we have a responsibility, a historical responsibility that respects the nature of our province, the heritage of our province, then we really want to see this province go forward in harmony with all peoples. In fact, that was the preamble to the motion put forward by our party back on that day.

No one can put in my mouth the words that say I am opposed to French-language services, or to the French, or to anything else. In fact I get very tired at attempts by people who try to label someone who disagrees with the government or other people as a racist or bigot or something he is not. Just because we happen to disagree with their approach we are painted into some kind of label that is really not reflective of our position.

Our position may not be the same as theirs. We may be looking for certain clarification of issues, but for other people to come along and label me and someone else who happens to disagree with them shows that they have no respect for the democratic rights that we have.

I happen to believe in the need for the French-language services that are being made available. I lived in the town of Penetanguishene for a number of years. In my experience there I came to respect and understand that there can be an excellent working relationship. I know from my experience on the school board when we brought in French-language teaching in the York Region Board of Education in 1973-74, a mandatory half-hour a day, it was the beginning of giving our children an immersion in French. We have extended that, we have confirmed it and we have built upon it. I think that we must continue to make that opportunity available for people.

Can you legislate all things for all people? I think we cannot. I think that we are in a position to provide the opportunity for all people to learn and to grow together. Here we are talking about a motion, and yet in my own local area the York Region Roman Catholic Separate School Board is considering the abolition of some French immersion programs because of the unavailability of money. That is a concern to the people of our community who are saying, "What can we do to provide that?" I support them in fighting for the funding that is available to help our young people to have the option of taking French immersion programs.

We are living in a marvellous place in the province of Ontario. If in fact we want to help address and resolve and respond to the questions that are being raised—our party brought forward a resolution on our opposition day which would have called for an all-party committee to take this concern out to the province of Ontario, soliciting the views of the public as they pertain to the implementation of this Bill 8, the French Language Services Act. Why it is that the other parties did not support it?

Mr Allen: You know that is not the—

Mr Cousens: Oh come on, the member's party did not support it, and today it comes in with another resolution that is not even going to take the members of the Legislature around the province. It is just going to be a very restrictive, government-controlled hearing that does not hear that much, not unlike many of the other hearings that have been had.

I say take it forward. Look back to the resolution that we presented. In that resolution we affirmed our support for French-language services, but we also affirmed our need to have an all-party committee of the Legislature to go out to look at this. Listen to the people of the province. Go into Sarnia, go into Thunder Bay, go into Penetanguishene, go into Cornwall, I do not care, but travel the province, and listen to the people of Ontario; if they are concerned, begin to listen to them.

1650

I go back to the statement that was made earlier today by the honourable member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry. I respect the fact that back in 1987 he asked the Premier at that time to start up a committee to begin that process so there could be some listening that goes on. We do it with the Ombudsman; we have an Ombudsman who is there serving the people of Ontario, and yet there is a standing committee on the Ombudsman that continues to monitor it so there is a court of last resort that consists of members of the Legislature. Why not have much the same kind of committee of the Legislature that is

looking at the implementation of French-language services? That is something of the idea that is implicit to the suggestion that was made by the member for Sarnia.

This is an important issue, and I would like to be able to say that we are all in agreement on it. It would appear that some people were not able to agree with the motion that was put forward by the member for Sarnia. I have some real problems with the kind of committee that is being structured by this motion. This committee will be a select committee on the Constitution. It has already been said by the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry that this is not the committee that should be doing the hearing and the listening; we want to see a committee that is going to travel this province and do something about it.

We are having problems right now with the French Language Services Act, and we can deal with it if we go out there and listen to the people of Ontario and stop just listening to ourselves. I think that is where the member for London North had a message to deliver today when she said this is a little boys' game that we are doing here in this Legislature. It would almost seem to be that, because one group has a motion one day, another group has a motion another day, and in fact we are just somehow missing the real issue. There are people out there hurting who want to be understood, who want to be listened to; let's go out there and listen to them as we can and should.

I would hope that the Legislature is open enough to really understand that this is one of the most important issues. I happen to believe that we in Ontario can continue to build relationships and bridges between people of all cultures—English and French, French and English—that we can have programs that allow us to work and do things together and that we can do it without judgement. We can do it with caring. We can do it as Canadians. We have a chance to do something in this country and in this province; let's deal with our provincial issues.

That is where we can begin to really make a difference: so those people who feel they are left out are not left out; so there is a public accounting of what is going on by this government that is not just done under a minister who has a closed book on how he is doing it, but it is instead an open book where there is a public declaration of what is going on, a public opportunity for sharing. That is what would happen with the motion that was put forward earlier by our party. That is not the suggestion that is implicit in the recommendations that are being made today.

I happen to believe that we must work together to make this a stronger province; that all of us can be working closer together. Somehow or other, with the motions that come forward and some of the little innuendoes that are brought in, we are not able to do that. I hope the day will come soon when we will all work together to make this happen; it can if we want it to.

I happen to be one who wants to support the need, the work and the opportunity for French-speaking people in our province to build on the French Language Services Act. We can do that, but we do not necessarily do it by the way in which this motion is recommending it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): Continuing with the debate, it is my pleasure to recognize the honourable minister from Scarborough-Agincourt.

Hon Mr Beer: Try York North.

The Acting Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Hon Mr Beer: I used to live in Scarborough, and I am very proud of the time that I passed there, but I am equally proud that I represent the riding of York North.

I rise to participate in the debate and to commend my friend and colleague the Leader of the Opposition for the motion that has been presented today, which I think places the issue in the appropriate context in which it should be placed. I also rise to speak on this issue and, I think, to a certain extent go through a personal journey, if you like. This is an issue that during my adult life—indeed, since I was at university, first at the University of Toronto and later at Université de Laval—I have felt extremely strongly about in terms of how we find the appropriate place for the English and French languages within Canada and within our own province.

I think the strength of the motion which has been put forward today is that it does indeed situate the question in terms of our country: What is it we see to be the role of both English and French in our province and in our country? To look at that issue, the select committee on constitutional and inter-governmental affairs is the best vehicle. Those of us who sat on the select committee two years ago when we were looking at the Meech Lake accord heard from many people and travelled within the province. We had people come in to speak to us. In fact, I think we were able to receive and speak to every group that requested time. I know the intent of my honourable friend's motion is that this committee would do some travelling to make sure that those who wanted to come before it were able to do so. I can certainly state on our behalf that would be our intention, to proceed in that manner.

What we are dealing with here is an age-old Canadian issue—dilemma, challenge, opportunity, whatever you want to call it—within this province, what today constitutes Ontario. There is no part of its history, save that when the native people first came, where there has not been a French presence in this area. We have, as a province and as a country since well before 1867, tried to work out the appropriate place, respect and rights of those two languages, I think in quite a proper fashion. We note that two of the fundamental characteristics of our country are the places of the English and the French languages.

It is important for us to come at the question that way when we are going out and talking with Ontarians about why we have Bill 8, why we have protection for educational rights and for minority linguistic and judicial rights. I think all of us over the course of the last years, whether we talk solely of the period from 1986 to 1989 during the implementation of the bill or later, have in our own ways—whether as my friend and colleague the member for Hamilton Centre noted through a public meeting in her own riding, or whether because of ministerial responsibilities or other responsibilities we are going into different parts of the province to talk about Bill 8—talked about linguistic duality and about why we are doing this.

When I go out I try to talk with fellow Ontarians in terms of what it is we are trying to do: What kind of country do we have, and how can we accommodate within that country a respect for English and French language rights? Where does Bill 8 fit into that? What is it we are trying to do with that bill?

When I do that, I can go back to my days when I worked at Queen's Park before I got into politics. I can remember listening to former premiers Robarts and Davis. I can remember listening to Donald MacDonald, Stephen Lewis, Michael Cassidy. I can remember listening to the member for Brant-Haldimand and Stuart Smith. When they spoke to this issue, it was, I believe, with the sense that we had to find a way of increasingly providing services, particularly to those areas of the province

where francophones were in a particular concentration in number and try to make sure that there was respect for basic services.

As I said before, under John Robarts, we began with the educational changes and have moved since the mid-1960s to the point today where we are trying to put in place what I believe to be a fair and reasonable number of services to the French-speaking population of this province. This is always in the context that what we are seeking is a country in which those basic services can be protected for all who are English-speaking or French-speaking. I think that is a critical principle that we have to say we want to support and protect.

Recently I had the pleasure of being up north in Thunder Bay and in Kapuskasing where the two northern Ontario municipal associations were meeting. With both associations, as in other parts of the province, we talked not just about Bill 8—with respect to my friend the member for London North, that is not the issue. What people are talking about is the question of language, the place of the two languages and how we protect them. Bill 8 is an important part, but the issue is broader and hence the need, I think, for the motion that has come before us.

1700

In the discussions I had last week, and have had with others over the course of the last couple of months, I have been struck increasingly by what is happening as we talk about this issue and as we focus on the country and where we want to see the protection of linguistic rights. In Thunder Bay, the member municipalities from the northwestern part of the province turned down a motion which would have spoken against the protection of French-language rights, and turned it down overwhelmingly, and when we spoke in Kapuskasing, there was strong support stated at the meeting from the member municipalities there for the provision of fair and reasonable French-language services.

When we look at some of the motions that have been passed, and admittedly there have been a number in which municipalities have declared themselves to be unilingual English, we must also remember that during that same period of time a very strong number of municipalities declared themselves to be bilingual and said they wanted to provide bilingual services, while other municipalities, where there was no particular French-speaking population, simply made clear that they wanted to dissociate themselves from any approach which would seem to indicate that French-speaking Canadians were not welcome.

I think there are in fact, as we have gone about this discussion, important trends, important threads, important debates that are going on where Ontarians are saying, "No, we want to find a fair and reasonable way to protect French-language rights in our province."

Maintenant, l'autre aspect de cette question : ce n'est pas simplement la question de l'approche des anglophones mais aussi la position des francophones de notre province dans ce débat. Il y a des choses très importantes qui sont arrivées, certainement depuis mon début dans cette question, c'est-à-dire depuis les années 60 où, de plus en plus, nous voyons une communauté de langue française en Ontario, communauté dynamique qui veut se montrer ferme, pour l'appui de ses droits linguistiques, communauté francophone qui veut dire à tout le monde que nous sommes Canadiens, que nous sommes Ontariens et que, pour la plupart, nous parlons les deux langues mais que nous pensons qu'il est juste et raisonnable qu'il y ait

une base de droits linguistiques garantis par notre Assemblée législative. Je pense de plus en plus que c'est exactement ce que l'Assemblée législative essaie de faire.

Par exemple, cela se voit maintenant non simplement dans le domaine de l'éducation, mais dans le domaine des garderies, dans le domaine des services sociaux, dans le domaine des services de santé, dans le domaine des affaires. Il est très important de souligner l'essor intéressant dans le domaine économique où, de plus en plus, nous voyons, que ce soit dans le nord, dans l'est ou dans le centre de notre province, un groupe dynamique de francophones, de gens d'affaires, qui veulent travailler en Ontario mais qui veulent aussi s'exprimer et travailler en français.

Nous savons aussi fort bien que nous avons une base de travailleurs dans tous les domaines, qu'on parle du domaine forestier, des mines ou de l'entreprise privée. De plus en plus, les francophones s'affirment ici en Ontario comme Canadiens, comme Ontariens. Ils ont le droit à certains services linguistiques. Je pense que tout le monde dans cette Assemblée législative va appuyer cette attitude.

Une chose que je viens de faire et qui est très important pour la communauté francophone, c'est l'établissement du Conseil ministériel des affaires francophones. Il y a deux ou trois semaines, on a tenu la première réunion de ce Conseil ministériel où j'ai demandé à Gérard Raymond et à ses collègues de voir, d'une façon stratégique, où nous allons, maintenant que nous avons certains droits dans le domaine de l'éducation, dans le domaine judiciaire et dans le domaine des services provinciaux. Maintenant, où devons-nous mettre nos efforts pour nous assurer que les droits linguistiques soient vraiment garantis dans notre province ?

Je pense que cette initiative inclut, je dois le dire, les anglophones et les francophones multiculturels et les francophones de souche dans cette province. Donc, ça va être un travail d'ensemble. Nous devons souligner que, ces jours-ci, à l'intérieur de cette communauté dynamique de francophones en Ontario, de plus en plus nous avons des communautés qui parlent français et qui ne viennent pas du Canada mais d'autres pays.

Donc, la réalité francophone de notre province, que ce soit à Toronto, à Ottawa ou dans d'autres centres, est de plus en plus comme la communauté anglophone : c'est-à-dire, une communauté multiculturelle. Donc, on trouve, par exemple, dans le Conseil scolaire de Toronto que la moitié des représentants francophones sont de la province et que l'autre moitié vient d'autres pays.

Alors, il est important, pour les francophones de notre province, d'appuyer les principes de cette motion. Je pense que nous voulons le faire. Il est très important pour nous de dire clairement à la population pourquoi nous le faisons.

One of the questions that is often raised is how we find a way for people to express concerns about the way we implement language policy. Even leaving aside those people who would prefer not to see any kind of linguistic duality in this province, I think there are very legitimate, reasonable, fair questions that people should feel very free to put forward and where by no means is anyone suggesting that somebody is a bigot or a racist simply because he raises questions. This is a democracy and it is important that we express those points of view.

I have often told the story, and some honourable members may know this one, that after former Premier Robarts had stepped down as Premier he headed the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto. There was a presentation made by one individual who recommended, because Metropolitan Toronto

was becoming so very much multireligious, multiracial, multicultural, that there was a need, this gentleman thought, for what he called the tower of Babel. He wanted to put this tower of Babel in North York. What would happen is that you would walk into this tower, and he said one of the problems was that people get very uptight about language issues, about religious issues, about racial issues, and so he wanted a place where somebody could go in and let that frustration off. You would go into this tower and within that area you could say whatever you wanted. When you came out, around the tower would be a kind of a tea-house or a coffee-house where you would then sit down and talk with your friend and neighbour.

While that was made somewhat tongue in cheek, I think it spoke to a particular concern where perhaps people sometimes are afraid to talk about fears they have over change. What does this changing linguistic world in Ontario and Canada mean? How does it affect me? So we do have to ensure that people can say in terms of Bill 8, "If I live in North Bay or Timmins or Sarnia or Metropolitan Toronto, what are the implications of that act for me?" I think we not only have a responsibility to answer, I think we all do, as members of the Legislature, and certainly as the minister responsible for francophone affairs, I feel that it is critical and I believe that we can do that.

When we look at the particular way Bill 8 has been implemented, I would have to say we are dealing with the various concerns that are being brought up from time to time by individuals and that members bring to my attention, and that through the kind of process that the Leader of the Opposition has suggested in his particular motion, in point of fact all of those issues can be addressed. I would say as well that I find it of interest that another place where those can be addressed is if we get into the estimates debate and look at some of the specific aspects of the French Language Services Act. I have said I am always prepared to sit down and look at what the rules and regulations of that act are, because it is not terribly confusing, it is fairly direct and straightforward and, as members know, the act itself is really quite a simple act.

1710

So we come back, then, I believe, to the question that is raised when we address language in this country. That question is: How do we, in 1990, view our country? How do we want to see our country over the next 20 or 25 years? As a generation that is really all the time we can foresee. What has our history meant, our working together as English- and French-speaking Canadians, to whom we have added, over time, people from all sorts of other cultures and groups but who have accepted that in terms of language, we have two national languages in Canada?

What does that history mean? Is that something we are going to throw away? Is it beyond our capability to find a way within Canada, within Ontario in 1990, to respect fundamental, basic linguistic rights? I think that is the way the question has to be posed. I believe that within the context of the select committee on constitutional and intergovernmental affairs it then allows us to address that question with a broader scope and that thereby when we look at educational changes or we look at Bill 8 or various other provisions, government policy, things that we would like to see be done, I think we have a context, then, which makes clearer why Ontario should be doing these things.

What is it we are doing? One of the key things is that we have targeted our approach. We have targeted, as my colleague the member for Peterborough pointed out, some 83% to 85% of the regions of the province where the francophone population lives. We have done that through a designation of areas that

follows from that which the Conservative government in the 1970s developed and that itself came from the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the 1960s. Again, it was trying to take principle and in a pragmatic, fair and reasonable way say: "We can do this as a society. It is important that we try to ensure those rights and we do it in a way that does not take away from any English-speaking Ontarian's rights, we do it in a way that does not in any way affect the provision of services to the English-speaking population and we do it in a way that we believe is fair and reasonable and meets the needs of the francophone community."

That will take place in different ways in different parts of the province. If I look at my Ministry of Community and Social Services, this morning, for example, I met with my senior staff and we were looking at the progress that we had been able to make over the last six months to a year in ensuring the provision of French-language social services to the French-speaking community of Ontario in the designated areas. As my honourable friend the member for Scarborough West pointed out, when you think of some key areas that affect people directly, certainly social services and health are equally as important as education.

I am reminded of the story that the Minister of Natural Resources tells where she, at one point before she was elected, was in a hospital in Thunder Bay and while she was waiting a young girl was brought in with her family. That family did not speak English. The young girl was injured and at that time there was nobody within that hospital who was able, other than with some high school French, which the minister then used, to try to determine just what was wrong with the young girl.

I think sometimes when we personalize those situations and we say to ourselves, "What are we really trying to do?" there is a context there that really is fair and reasonable, that speaks to helping people, that underlines our respect for the rights of English- and French-speaking Ontarians and in that context that covers all of us. It is very important that we be able to do that, because most of us in this House who are English-speaking Canadians, were we to be travelling in other parts of the country, whether in Quebec or northern New Brunswick, for example, where the dominant population is certainly French-speaking, I think we would like to be able to expect that those kinds of services would in fact be available for us. That is what we are doing.

We really are going to be the root of our Canadian identity. Perhaps sometimes we get so passionate about the language issue that we cannot just take a bit of a step back and say: "Hey, it's language; it's providing service. It is not the end of the world. We can do it. We really are capable of doing it." When we look at all the change going on in the world, when we look at the fact that this is a country which, by and large, has been extremely tolerant and open towards differences, whether they be linguistic or cultural or racial or religious, then surely we have to say to ourselves that if we are unable to find a way to bring the English- and French-speaking populations to live in harmony together, how much more difficult is it going to be to deal with issues around multiracialism or, increasingly, multi-religious issues? Surely, the route to building and ensuring a fair and tolerant society in Canada is by beginning with the respect for the two national languages and for what flows from that.

I believe that within the Leader of the Opposition's motion is a way in which we can reaffirm our support for those protections, whereby we can make clear to municipalities that we are talking about provincial services, where we are providing

through the select committee on constitutional and inter-governmental affairs a means to address these issues, and that thereby we can ensure that in Ontario we will protect minority language rights.

The Acting Speaker: I would like to thank the honourable member for York North. I apologize for erring on his riding.

Mr Mackenzie: I am pleased to support the resolution by my leader affirming a matter of fairness and justice to one of the two founding groups in our country and province, Bill 8, the French Language Services Act. I would like to have time to read into the record the Ontario Federation of Labour's statement on minority language rights, but I do not. I commend it for reading to all of the members of this House.

Let me add my own thoughts very briefly and my very strongly held feelings. I was raised in the town of Buckingham, Quebec, and I can tell the members that I soon learned that the rights and privileges of the anglo population—I probably learned most of it after I moved out of Buckingham, as I grew up—are much more strongly protected and entrenched than most of the rights the francophones have in the rest of this country and in this province of Ontario.

We are a nation that was really birthed on the basis of two founding races and both of us were usurpers in a land where the original aboriginal population lived. Our strength lies, and will lie, in our ability to live in brotherhood and equality and to recognize and respect the rights of both sides.

I regret the measure of intolerance that appears to exist in our society today. I regret the misinformation that has people call me and say, "Don't you know that we are really setting the stage for the French to take over Canada?" Or those who say that you cannot get a promotion or a job if you cannot speak French. It is not true. It is not what Bill 8 does. I think all of us in this House know that.

I trust that no members of this House and no party in this House will take the low road and play to that kind of fear, intolerance and misinformation that exists in our society today.

We have here in Ontario today, as far as I am concerned, an opportunity that we simply have to grab, and that is to renew the bonds that keep our nation together. This is what I want: I want my country strong; I want it united. I do not think it is the same Canada if we do not exist with the kind of Confederation that we have today. I understand that to keep this country together we have to recognize and consider whether or not we have been fair and tolerant, and whether the rights exist to both parties to the original Confederation.

I am concerned about the future of my country. I support and hope that all who share that concern will recognize the importance of this debate we are holding here today, because I think it is the road that Ontario is taking now to make sure that this country does exist as a united Canada with full respect for both sides in this issue.

1720

Mr Harris: I want to say a few words on this resolution. I will not go over a lot of the ground when I spoke on the previous resolution that was moved by my party some six weeks ago, when I talked extensively about some of the concerns that are around the province, about the fact that I regretted very much that some municipalities felt the need to pass the unilingual, English-only resolutions, and my desire, as I was travelling the province at the time and spoke to those municipalities, to encourage them not to do so but to take a more positive

approach to the concerns that they had, essentially with this government.

The municipal resolutions, in particular, really in my view—and I recognize that there are other concerns; the country is of great concern to me, and the constitutional discussions that are going on—were aimed specifically at the Premier of this province and at this government for lack of consultation, for lack of discussion on a whole host of programs. The member for Scarborough West in his remarks pointed out that municipalities felt, and I agree with him, there was concern about some other hidden agenda.

I think we ought to use this opportunity to dispel that. I think we should use a committee to dispel that and I would like to hear clearly, from the government and from the opposition, that they would dispel that as well.

All members of this House have reaffirmed their support and their commitment. A recognition that there is an obligation—and more than an obligation, indeed a desire—to want to provide services to the minority French in our province is not in question. It is not in question. I have not heard it in question from a single member of my caucus. I have not heard it in question from a single member of the Liberal Party or a single member of the New Democratic Party, not one. Yet all the speeches today talk about this, that we want to reaffirm our commitment to this. That is not in question.

My party brought forward a resolution under the leadership of a very capable leader of this party six weeks ago asking this House to reaffirm that, and we in our caucus voted unanimously for that. The rest of the parties, for whatever reason, felt that that was not the vehicle with which they wanted to reaffirm their support and today, listening to the speeches, I understand that they plan to do it in a different way by supporting this resolution.

My colleague the member for London North has said there are a lot of games being played and it is childish and it does not look good on any of us and it does not look good to the public, and I agree with her. It does not.

When my caucus supported unanimously our reaffirmation of the obligation and the desire of our caucus to provide French-language services, we clearly are on the record in wanting to do that. The New Democratic Party will be on the record today—I guess this is what it wanted to do, why we are debating this today—to catch up to us and reaffirm its support as well.

I understand that and I accept that. I will not question anywhere, with any member of Ontario, the desire to reaffirm that commitment. However, what I will question is this resolution versus our resolution. What a disgrace it is that it took two days of debate and it had to come from the two opposition parties, not the government.

None of these resolutions, on the Leader of the Opposition's part or my former leader's part, would have been necessary at all had the government taken the initiative, listened to what had been going on across this province and listened to the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, who has been saying for three years that there are concerns out there and we had better talk about them.

It is no longer good enough for us to say we all support the provision of French-language services. We had better go out and consult, sell our position, if you like, sell that need. I think that is part of it. I am a promoter providing French-language services. Those members who have heard me speak in the past and who have listened to anything I have said will realize that.

I have said throughout the process I was involved in that there are still some services that needed to be provided that are

not provided today. I pointed out those examples in my riding in many areas of northern Ontario. I have pointed out those examples in areas of eastern Ontario and I believe we should be discussing that as well. I have not talked dollars and cents, although we know that protecting minority rights costs some money.

I find it ironic and sad that it is okay for a politician to criticize the Provincial Auditor, when he is the watchdog over the rest of us, for getting a 12% or 13% increase in this past year for all his own employees, which I wanted to get on the record, by the way. It is okay. Two years in a row?

It is okay, acceptable for a politician to say, "We think you are wasting a lot of money in how you are providing educational services in this province." Nobody comes forward and says, "Oh, that person is opposed to public education or government money going to education or the provision of those services."

It is okay for me to stand in this place and criticize the Liberals for wasting billions of dollars on the health care system. They will not agree with me, I appreciate that, but they are. But none of them, I do not think, is going to say, "Well, obviously Harris, the leader"—it is hard to say that word now; I am just getting used to it—"the leader of this party is suggesting that the government should not be providing health care services." I do not think they would attempt to say that.

Yet when somebody criticizes how they are implementing something we all agree with, the provision of services, somehow many of them want to come forward and say, "Oh, you are opposed to providing French-language services."

Mr Jackson: That is misleading.

Mr Harris: That is very misleading, and when I spoke in this House six weeks ago, many members of both of the other parties were critical of me, saying, "Oh, you are against providing French-language services." That is totally erroneous, very unfair and is divisive and is dishonest.

Mr Jackson: What are you afraid of?

Mr Harris: What are you afraid of is right. It is dishonest. So we all agree, and after today it will be on the record. What a sad thing it is that the government has not been forthcoming with a resolution of its own; that it took the two opposition parties to bring this to its attention and to insist that we begin to talk about the concerns that are out there. Now I assume by the government's acceptance of this resolution today that finally, after three years, it has awoken to the fact that there is some criticism out there—

Mr McGuigan: Awoken?

Mr Harris: Awakened? Thank you.

There is some criticism of how the government is implementing Bill 8. That, indeed, is a provincial issue.

Now I want to get to the two resolutions and why I believe that our resolution made much more sense. It is a resolution we have been calling for for three years. It is the concerns that our party has been hearing and all members have been hearing in their constituency offices for three years.

1730

When my colleague the member for London North and I toured this province and visited community after community after community, this was the concern that we heard about. We heard about mismanagement in the health care system, the disastrous policies there. We heard about mismanagement in the education dollars. We heard about high taxes. We heard about all those things and we heard about mismanagement of how this

government was living up to our commitment to provide services to the francophone minority.

I heard in many areas of this province about services that were not being provided, and a certain amount of resentment that there was lots of money for a whole bunch of symbols. There was lots of money for other areas of the province, yet there was not money in some small communities, as the member for Scarborough West said, for mental health care services, for children's services, for a speech pathologist for unilingual francophone children—many in my riding—who have speech impediments.

Surely members would agree with me that that has a higher priority than some signage, a symbol somewhere—

Mr Jackson: Liquor stores have it.

Mr Harris: Liquor stores, right—a sign somewhere in downtown Toronto. Surely members would agree with me that that need, and some of the others, is not being met today. Surely the members would agree with me about the need of a unilingual widow in a small community in eastern Ontario, when her husband has passed on, her family has moved on, and she cannot find a senior citizens' home or a retirement home where she can live out her last years and be served in the French language. These were the kinds of things I heard when I travelled this province.

I think it is quite legitimate, and obviously the members now agree with us that it is legitimate, to say: "There are some concerns. There are some problems. Maybe we better consult with the people on it." There is no doubt about our commitment. Now members have two motions that they have had the opportunity to look at.

One motion says: "Let's deal with the problem. Let's travel the province. Let's have open hearings. Let's be up front and public about our commitments and let's hear if there are concerns. Let's see if some of them make sense and let's adapt to that in our implementation, if that indeed is what we should be doing." Then we have this motion which, I understand, had to be different from ours because the members did not want to support ours. It was our idea and we have been talking about it for three years. There is petty politics involved in this.

Mr Sterling: Silly games.

Mr Harris: There are silly games involved in this.

Now the New Democratic Party has brought forward its resolution. Do the members know what concerns me about this resolution? There are a few things that I think are sending very mixed signals across this province. One is linguistic duality. I want to know what the Leader of the Opposition means by linguistic duality. The public does not understand it.

Mr B. Rae: It is in the Meech Lake accord.

Mr Harris: The public does not understand the Meech Lake accord.

Mr B. Rae: You voted for it.

Mr Harris: I voted for it, but the public does not understand it.

Mr B. Rae: Now you are changing your mind on that too.

Mr Harris: No, I am not changing my mind on that. I think the Leader of the Opposition better explain what he means—

Interjections.

Mr Harris: Here come all the rabbits who want to confuse the issue. I understand that.

The Leader of the Opposition will have an opportunity to defend his motion. I would like him to explain to me what he means by linguistic duality. I can tell him what I mean, and I explain it everywhere I go. I am pleased and proud to do that. I am well on the record, in my speech six weeks ago, on what linguistic duality means to me. I think it is different from what it means to Pierre Trudeau. It is different from what it means to the majority, 90% francophones, in Quebec. I would like to know what he means by linguistic duality.

The second thing I would like explained to me is why he wants to use the select committee on constitutional and inter-governmental affairs, which I was told was struck to do one of two things. One, if Meech passes, the Constitution committee was to begin the work and send the signal out that we were prepared to begin the work on Senate reform. Send that signal out now. That would help get support for Meech Lake. Send the right signals, and if Meech Lake carries, we would deal with Senate reform.

The second reason I assume the constitutional committee was struck is that if perchance, and God forbid, our first ministers are not able to arrive at a consensus on our Constitution, we would quickly need a committee up and running to deal with the Constitution and with the issues before this country.

Why does the government want to send the implementation of Bill 8 and the concerns under provincial statute to the Constitution committee? Why does it want to muddy the waters? Let me say this, and this will get a great reaction from the government: Our commitment to provide French-language services is not conditional on Quebec. It is not conditional on Meech Lake. It is Ontario's commitment. With or without a country, God forbid, our party will provide services to the francophone minority in this province.

They are entitled to those services. We recognize that and we want to provide them. In no way is the commitment of my party conditional on what happens with Meech Lake, the constitutional discussions, Quebec or the rest of it. If we feel Quebec has been unfair, fine, express that. But that does not mean that my party will be unfair to minorities here in this province or will be unfair to the francophone minority in this province.

We in our party have a long history of being generous to minorities. We are proud of that history. We are proud of that aspect of the heritage of our party. We are proud of those leaders who took leadership roles in providing those services. Indeed, Progressive Conservative governments were responsible for many of the services now available, including the translation of Ontario statutes, the creation of the Office of Francophone Affairs to advise government, the establishment of the office of the government co-ordinator of French-language services, the use of French in the Legislature and the courts, the opening of bilingual civil service positions and the establishment of the right of francophone children to education in this province.

Let me say to the government that our commitment is unwavering, in a commonsense way, where there is a demonstrated need, to provide those services, dependent not at all on Quebec, not on what other provinces do, not on what Canada does, not on what the country does. We are elected by the people of Ontario. That is our commitment and we will stick to it. We do not want to muddy the waters. We do not want a wishy-washy resolution. We do not want to confuse the public. The members of the public said to my colleague the

member for London North and to myself that they are tired of games. They are tired of the childishness. They are tired of wishy-washiness.

They do not understand how this Legislature works. They want to know where the government stands. I hope today I have clearly put on the record our support and where we draw the line on silliness and the commonsense solution that we are looking for to the problems facing this province.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: I would like to remind the honourable member for Durham-York and the Minister of Tourism, neither of whom is in his place, that it would probably be more appropriate to have interjections when they are in the right seats. I know the minister of the crown should know better.

Mr Morin-Strom: This resolution, I believe, is a vitally important one that we are addressing here today. We are addressing one and we are being given the opportunity here in Ontario to show real political leadership on an issue that can be profoundly divisive in communities in our province and right across the country. I have seen the kind of divisiveness that can result when political leadership in a community takes a position which is supportive of those who want to foster intolerance. I am saddened today to see that the Conservatives are willing to use this kind of resolution for partisan political purposes.

1740

This resolution has nothing in it that has not been affirmed previously by this Legislature, and all three political parties should have the will to show their support for these affirmations. Most fundamentally, we are affirming our shared belief that linguistic duality is a fundamental characteristic of our country. Beyond that, we are taking pride in the fact that access for the French-speaking minority in Ontario to the courts, education, public broadcasting, proceedings of the Legislature and provincial services in designated areas has been a shared commitment of different political parties and governments over many years.

In the recent decades when many of these initiatives came forward, in fact, it was the Conservatives who were in power in this province and it was by their initiatives under Robarts and Bill Davis that we have made important steps forward in providing important services to francophones in Ontario. We are continuing that and we have continued that with the French Language Services Act. This act applies only to the provision of provincial government services to members of the public and can be achieved without diminishing services for the English-speaking majority. It implies nothing with respect to decisions on municipal services. This is not a threat to our multicultural society in any way.

I am pleased that others in my community have supported the initiatives of this government and recent provincial governments. In fact, with respect to the multicultural nature of Canada, I have a letter from the Multicultural Association of Sault Ste Marie which says it "...is extremely concerned that a resolution declaring Sault Ste Marie English-only was passed. We feel that this resolution will only cause divisiveness in the community." They went on to say: "The Constitution states that we are a bilingual country in a multicultural framework. We are happy to see that some attempts are being made to heal the wounds in this community and hope that it will continue."

I believe that this resolution is a way for us as a provincial government, as a Legislature, and all three parties to stand

together to try to heal the wounds of divisiveness and to lead us in a direction, a future of our country that will ensure that the two fundamental linguistic groups in Canada are full partners in our association as a country.

Mr B. Rae: The origin of this resolution is of some interest. It goes back some time. I suggested, after a meeting of our caucus that was held in Cambridge, that it would be a good idea for us as a party to try to work with the other two parties in forging an all-party agreement in the face of a number of resolutions which were coming from a number of municipalities, which I felt were unnecessary. I thought they were based on a profound misunderstanding of the resolution of Bill 8, which was the law which we had all sat in this House and debated and passed, and I felt it was important for us to take a position of leadership. When I say "us," I do not mean the New Democratic Party; I mean the members of this House.

I say with regret that I was unable to convince either the Premier or the leader of the Conservative Party of the wisdom of this approach. I say the Premier because, by his absence, by his refusal to have meetings, by his indifference to the many suggestions which were made to him and by members of my staff to his staff, he has shown me very clearly that he does not believe that it is a good idea to take a clear position, and he does not think it is a good idea for us to be continuing to take a clear position such as the one that I have tried to put forward.

The leader of the Conservative Party—I do not mean the new leader, I mean the former leader. When we were at our one and only session to discuss this concept, as I have told the House on other occasions, I was, without any warning, at a quarter to 6 in the evening, presented with a fait accompli of a resolution from the Conservative Party saying: "This is being moved. It has gone up to the press gallery. This is our opposition day. We have submitted it and that is the basis upon which we are moving." There were no discussions.

When I hear from the members of the Conservative Party about games or gamesmanship, I wish I was a better games player. Sometimes I feel I might have been more successful if I was. What we have attempted to do may not even be politically wise. It may well be—

Mr Runciman: Like the accord.

Mr B. Rae: The member for Leeds-Grenville says, "Like the accord." I remind him that I am the leader of the official opposition and he is now a member of the third party, so I do not know what worked and what did not work.

I hope that members will hear me out on this, because I do not intend to be unduly partisan. What I want to say to the members is this: I have heard what members of the Conservative Party has had to say about this resolution, and I can understand several reasons why they might or might not be able to support it. But what I do believe—and I still believe this—is that, honestly, the vast majority of the members of this House, and I indeed include members of the Conservative Party, support the principle of this resolution.

The principle of the resolution, as we discussed it in our caucus several months ago, was this: that we wanted to affirm in a positive way—not in a negative way or in a halfhearted or a halfhanded way—a central fact about our life as Canadians and as Ontarians. We are Ontarians and we are Canadians, and we cannot think of these things as being completely separate. They are joined up with one another. A central fact of our life as Ontarians is that for hundreds of years in this community on the shores of Lake Ontario, Lake Erie and Lake Superior, and by the banks of the Ottawa River, there have been people whose

first language is French. It was French 300 years ago, it was French 200 years ago, it was French 100 years ago, it is French today and, God willing, it will be French 100 years from now. That is a fact about our life.

The other fact is that we have moved consistently, as a Legislature, together. We have moved together as a Legislature because there has been an understanding among the leadership of the province that that is how we must move because we know the history of Ontario, we know the history of division, we know the history of linguistic, racial and religious division in this province, and we know that unless we strive to overcome it by crossing over partisan boundaries and partisan barriers, we will end up dividing ourselves, dividing families and seeing a community that is more divided than it needs to be.

We felt that it was important to state categorically—I say this as one who moved the amendment with respect to municipalities in Bill 8, and I can recall saying very clearly on that day that the message has to go to the municipalities that nothing in this legislation is forcing French down their throats. That is the expression I used, and I spoke in English on that day. What we are saying is that if a municipality wants to declare itself bilingual because of the needs of its community, this is how it can do it. But there is absolutely no requirement that that is what they should do.

The language of the majority in this province is English. It was English, it is English and it will be English. Let's be commonsensical about it. We speak English the vast majority of the time in this Legislature. Governments do their business a vast majority of their time in English. That is not going to change. No government fiat is going to make that change. No law is going to change that. But what we are doing with Bill 8—and what needs to be done and continues to need to be done—is saying to the francophone community, “You can be at home in this province, and you have a right and are entitled to services in this province.” That is what we are saying, and that is all we are saying.

Mrs Cunningham: We agree with that.

1750

Mr B. Rae: The members of the Conservative Party say they agree with it, and that is what I am saying. I am delighted that they agree with it. I am delighted that they support it.

Mrs Cunningham: You could have voted for it six weeks ago.

Mr B. Rae: I say that the importance of this resolution is that it is positive and very specific. It talks very specifically about the French Language Services Act. It talks very specifically about how that act is supposed to work.

Mrs Cunningham: So did ours.

Mr B. Rae: I say there is a difference. If the members have difficulty supporting this resolution, I am sorry. I cannot comment on what those reasons might be. I am sorry they are not able to support it.

Mrs Cunningham: We were sorry you didn't support ours.

Mr B. Rae: I would simply say to the member for London North, whom we welcome on the front bench, provided she hears me out this afternoon, that I think it is important that it be the select committee on the Constitution that does this work with respect to services—very specifically mentioned—and with respect to education. I will say why: Because it is an

illusion to think that the only thing the public in Ontario is concerned about now is Bill 8. It is an illusion to think that you can separate the feelings of English-speaking citizens in this province with respect to French-language rights without understanding that how we respond to those concerns itself has an impact on the Constitution of the country. We have suffered for too long from the illusion and, if I may say so, some municipalities have suffered from the illusion that they could take a decision with respect to their municipality and somehow no one else would hear about it or be affected by it.

La réalité du Canada, c'est que les décisions prises par les municipalités qui ont dit qu'elles voulaient être unilingues anglaises ont eu un impact profond sur le reste du pays, elles ont eu un impact profond sur le Québec et sur les discussions constitutionnelles.

La réalité est que, vu les communications qui existent à présent, les décisions prises par cette Législature, les décisions prises même par des municipalités et par des conseils scolaires ont un impact et des conséquences réels et importants pour l'avenir du Canada et pour l'avenir de l'Ontario.

The reason why it is, in part, a question that is worthy of consideration by the select committee on the Constitution is because no municipality is an island and no Legislature in this country is an island. If any member of this House thinks that what this Legislature does has no impact on opinion in the province of Quebec, or that what a municipal council does has no impact on the province of Quebec, or that what a municipal school board does has no impact on the province of Quebec, he is severely mistaken, he is missing the point.

I think Mr Bourassa made a mistake. I think Mr Bourassa's mistake was to think that somehow he could bring in Bill 78 with the notwithstanding clause and somehow it would have no impact on the rest of the country, that the rest of the country would simply say: “Oh, that's okay. That's just Quebec.” I am sorry. I say this to Mr Bourassa—and I have said it to him—“The decisions that you are taking are having an impact here.”

I say to my friends in the Conservative Party that the decisions that they take here and the decisions that municipalities take here will have an impact on the future of Canada. I say to the members of the Conservative Party that there were leaders of the Conservative Party who understood that. John Robarts understood that, Leslie Frost understood that, Bill Davis understood that, and I dare say the member for Sarnia understood that.

Mr Jackson: Gary Doer doesn't understand that in Manitoba.

Mr B. Rae: These are issues that have an impact, and we have to see it from that perspective. We have to see this from a Canadian perspective as well as from an Ontarian perspective and understand that as we move in education, as we move with respect to services, this is an issue that has something to do—not everything, but surely at least something—with the future of Canada and with the constitutional makeup of Canada.

Having said that, I believe profoundly that there is in this House a recognition of two things: first, that we must move ahead and, second, that there have been problems. I make no bones about the fact that I have talked to the minister and that my colleagues have talked to the minister. My colleague the member for Algoma, my colleague the member for Sudbury East and my colleague the member for Nickel Belt have spoken with the minister in some detail about concerns that have been raised by their constituents, and I think that is perfectly appropriate. I think it is perfectly appropriate that we hear from

the public, but let us not confuse listening to the public with our playing footsie with every person who says, "Well, now, I am not opposed to this, but really—"and then you end up having a conversation and you realize that really they are opposed to absolutely every notion of protecting the rights of Franco-Ontarians in the province.

We have to understand that there are some people who are opposed to French-language rights. They have a right to express that opinion, but I dare say we must state categorically that if we were to eliminate those rights, or to play footsie with those who would eliminate those rights, it would mean the end of Canada. It is quite simple. Unless we are prepared as citizens in this province to recognize that there must be tolerance here and that there will be tolerance as a matter of law and as a matter of right, we will end up with a country that is even more divided than the one we have today and a country that cannot hold. I refuse to believe that we can separate ourselves off in this province from that debate and this discussion.

In conclusion, I want to say I have heard members of the Conservative Party say and shout out today that they are going to make this a major issue in the election campaign.

Mrs Cunningham: No, we didn't.

Mr B. Rae: I heard that from the member for Burlington South clear as clear could be. I heard him say it.

Mr Jackson: I was talking about the Manitoba election. This was the position of the NDP, the NDP position in the next provincial election. You know that's what I'm talking about. This is Gary Doer's position.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr B. Rae: I will certainly allow the member to respond if he wishes after I have concluded.

I just want to say to all the members of this House that there is no way of predicting what the issues in an election campaign are going to be; and I say that if the question of the rights of minorities in this province are to become an issue in the elec-

tion, let that be. I can tell members where I stand, where my party stands and where my party has stood. We are supporting a principle that we believe will help to hold this country together, that tolerance must be at the base of our policies, must be at the base of what we share, and if one has to go into an election campaign defending tolerance, I am proud to go into an election campaign defending tolerance.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

1805

The House divided on Mr B. Rae's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. B. Rae, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour—77

Adams, Allen, Ballinger, Beer, Black, Bossy, Breagh, Brown, Bryden, Callahan, Campbell, Caplan, Charlton, Chiarelli, Cleary, Collins, Conway, Cooke, D. S., Cordiano, Curling, Daigeler, Eakins, Elliot, Faman, Faubert, Fawcett, Ferraro, Fontaine, Grandmaitre, Haggerty, Hampton, Hart, Henderson, Johnston, R. F., Kanter, Kerrio, Keyes, Kormos, Kozyra, Kwinter, Laughren, Lupusella, MacDonald, Mackenzie, Mancini, Martel, Matrundola, McGuigan, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Morin-Strom, Neumann, O'Neil, H., O'Neill, Y., Oddie Munro, Patten, Pelissero, Philip, E., Phillips, G., Polsinelli, Poole, Pouliot, Rae, B., Ray, M. C., Reville, Reycraft, Riddell, Roberts, Ruprecht, Smith, D. W., Smith, E. J., Sola, South, Tatham, Wildman, Wrye.

Nays/Contre—15

Cousens, Cunningham, Cureatz, Eves, Harris, Jackson, Johnson, J. M., Marland, McCague, McLean, Pollock, Runciman, Sterling, Villeneuve, Wiseman.

The House adjourned at 1808.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS
(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaitre, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray

Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edgheffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Tuesday 15 May 1990

Members' statements

Kindergarten	1203
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Police services	1203
Mr Pollock	
Visions 2020	1203
Mr Fleet	
Teachers	1203
Mr Farnan	
Wayne Olmsted	1204
Mr Jackson	
Automobile drivers	1204
Mr Tatham	
Workers' compensation board	1204
Mr Laughren	
Ontario Training Corp	1204
Mrs Cunningham	
Manitoulin island	1204
Mr Brown	

Oral questions

Police use of firearms	1208
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Offer	
Police commission nomination	1209
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Peterson	
Taxation	1209
Mr Harris	
Mr Peterson	
Waste reduction	1210
Mr Harris	
Mr Bradley	
Education funding	1211
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Mr Conway	
Toronto waterfront	1212
Mr Cousens	
Mr Sweeney	
Teachers' labour dispute	1212
Mr Chiarelli	
Mr Conway	
Taxation	1213
Mr Laughren	
Mr R. F. Nixon	
Transportation for the disabled	1213
Mrs Marland	
Ms Collins	
Truck identification	1214
Mr Tatham	
Mr Wrye	
Rent review	1214
Mr D. S. Cooke	
Mr Sweeney	

Chicken industry	1215
Mr Villeneuve	
Mr Ramsay	
Textile industry	1215
Mr Owen	
Mr R. F. Nixon	
Liquor licence revenues	1215
Mr Farnan	
Mr R. F. Nixon	
Teachers' labour dispute	1216
Mr Sterling	
Mr Conway	

Report by committee

Standing committee on government agencies	1216
Mr Sterling	
Adjourned	1216

First readings

Human Resources Professionals Association of Ontario	
Act, 1990, Bill Pr70 29	1216
Mrs Cunningham	
Agreed to	
Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 166	1216
Mrs Cunningham	
Agreed to	
Ontario Food Terminal Amendment	
Act, 1990, Bill 167	1216
Mr Sterling	
Agreed to	

Opposition day

French-language services, motion 3	1216
Mr Allen	1217
Mr Villeneuve	1218
Mr Adams	1219
Mr Laughren	1221
Mrs Cunningham	1222
Ms Oddie Munro	1223
Mr R. F. Johnston	1225
Mr Cousens	1225
Mr Beer	1227
Mr Mackenzie	1229
Mr Harris	1229
Mr Morin-Strom	1232
Mr B. Rae	1232
Agreed to	1234

Other business

Member for Nipissing	1205
Mr Conway	
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Harris	

Patricia Starr inquiry	1207	Lists of members	
Mr D. S. Cooke			
Adjournment	1234	Members and their responsibilities	1235
		Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1238

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mardi 15 mai 1990

Jour réservé à l'opposition			
Services en français	1216	M. Adams	1219
M. Allen	1217	M. Beer	1227
M. Villeneuve	1218	M. B. Rae	1232
		Adoptée	1234



Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 16 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 16 mai 1990



Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 16 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Miss Martel: While the Workers' Compensation Board tells us its new strategies and new technologies are providing better service to injured workers, the reality is that nothing has changed. In fact, my colleagues and I would argue that in the last year things have become even worse.

Take the case of Pierre Labbe of Kirkland Lake. In December 1989 his compensable condition worsened and his specialist ordered him off work. After repeated calls by the union, a decision to provide benefits was finally made on 30 April, some five months after his layoff. His cheques still do not arrive on time.

In January 1990 Mr Labbe had to travel from Kirkland Lake to Sudbury and back—some 630 kilometres—to be seen for a pension assessment. He paid the expenses out of his own pocket and has yet to be reimbursed. To add insult to injury, he has now been told he must travel from Kirkland Lake to North Bay and back—some 500 kilometres—to see his rehab counselor. He cannot afford to do so at this time.

Because of the board's delay in making a decision in providing benefits, Mr Labbe was forced to move his family out of their apartment and into a vacant home owned by his father. I wonder what they would have done without that support.

Things are not better at the Workers' Compensation Board. The president cannot be believed when he says the changes are providing better services to clients. As I have done in the past, I again call on the Minister of Labour to fully investigate problems at the Workers' Compensation Board.

WCB PUBLICITY CAMPAIGN

Mrs Marland: I was recently supplied with information relating to a publicity campaign conducted by the Workers' Compensation Board in late January and early February to explain Bill 162. The cost and purpose of this campaign is outrageous, to say the very least. In five short weeks, the Ministry of Labour spent \$1,721,567 on media advertising utilizing all available daily newspapers in the province, all weeklies, all ethnic newspapers, all available television stations and all available radio stations.

The minister said that the purpose of the campaign was "to inform board stakeholders and the public that major changes have been made to the Workers' Compensation Board Act which could affect them, and to convey key thrusts of the legislation." The minister should be awarded a golden shovel for all his efforts. Communication tools included a guide to the bill, two separate information brochures, supermarket infoCentres, a poster, a 35-millimetre slide presentation, a telephone hotline, a video and numerous articles for special interest publications.

Here is a government which initially refused to hold province-wide public hearings on Bill 162 now making every effort to explain the bill well after it became law. Well done, Minister, and keep shovelling.

EASTER SEALS CAMPAIGN

Mr Ballinger: The slogan on the T-shirt I am wearing says, "This One's For Whipper." On behalf of myself and the honourable member for York North, I rise to pay tribute to Whipper Billy Watson, who was a resident of the village of Sharon in my riding.

As many members of this House know, Whipper passed away on 4 February of this year while he and his wife were vacationing in Florida. Whipper was, and remains, an important figure in York region. His successful efforts substantially funded the therapeutic pool and CAT scanner, both of which are located at York County Hospital.

Turning his focus province-wide, his efforts on behalf of the March of Dimes and Easter Seals are well known. Whipper was a recipient of this province's highest award, the Order of Ontario. A champion in the wrestling ring, Whipper also became a champion in our hearts.

This year's 14th annual Persechini run/walkathon is being staged in honour and memory of Whipper Watson. There is no greater honour York region residents could bestow upon Whipper than to get out and work hard to raise funds for one of his most cherished causes, Easter Seals.

We in this Legislature can do our part by encouraging the member for York North, the Minister of Community and Social Services, to do well as he travels the 10-kilometre course on Sunday 27 May.

We have in the gallery today the sponsor and driving force behind the run/walkathon, Joe Persechini, in the members' gallery. I hope all members will join the member for York North and myself in paying tribute to Mr Persechini and Whipper Watson.

WASTE REDUCTION

Mr Morin-Strom: Recognizing that each region of the province should solve its own waste problems, I am tabling a resolution today asking the government of Ontario to adopt a policy that no municipal or other garbage from southern Ontario should be shipped to any location in northern Ontario for treatment or disposal.

Southern Ontario municipalities must not be allowed to take an out of sight, out of mind approach to their garbage by shipping it to the north for disposal. Transporting garbage long distances is not only a waste of non-renewable energy supplies, but it also perpetuates the idea that we solve the garbage crisis by simply finding more places to put our trash.

The real solution is to create less garbage in the first place, in order to remove Canada from the dubious distinction of being the largest producer of garbage per person in the world. If the Liberal government really took waste reduction seriously, no municipality would even have to entertain the desperate idea of shipping its garbage hundreds of kilometres. Garbage reduction is best achieved by reducing the amount of unnecessary packaging of consumer products and reusing products such as pop bottles.

If the government does not get tough now on waste reduction, there will be no end to the steady stream of proposals for northern and rural dumping of big city garbage. The only way we are ever going to solve the garbage crisis is to stop looking for more places to put it. We have to stop wasting resources by

creating garbage and moving it around the province. Time is running out; there is no time to waste.

1340

SHELTERS FOR WOMEN

Mr McLean: My statement is for the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues and it concerns the recent announcement that her government will allocate \$2.2 million in 1990-91 to build at least nine new emergency shelters in Ontario for battered women. I think at this point it should be noted that this is the first time since 1986 that her government has promised to spend extra money to create new shelter space for battered women.

At any rate, the Orillia Women's Advocacy Group has been pleading for funds to create a shelter since 1988. The Orillia Women's Advocacy Group officially opened the doors of Green Haven, its office in Orillia, on 27 April. This office is currently used to provide a 24-hour hotline and to provide counselling for victims of abuse.

At the present time there is no emergency shelter for battered or abused women in Orillia. Now, more than ever, the people of Ontario are aware of the immediate need for safe havens for women who are trapped in abusive relationships. At the present time, abused women can turn to the Orillia Women's Advocacy Group for crisis counselling, support in locating free legal services and guidance throughout the court process, information about applying for general welfare and family benefits and information about self-help groups for victims of wife assault.

The time has now come to fund this centre. The minister should do it now, sooner than later.

POLICE USE OF FIREARMS

Mr Curling: I rise today to express my sincere concern over the recent shooting incident in Scarborough involving 16-year-old Marlon Neal. I am troubled by the incident and hope and pray for speedy justice. As a citizen, as a member of the provincial Parliament and as a parent, I think it is incumbent on all of us, as leaders and representatives, to demonstrate leadership in our various capacities.

We need understanding from all concerned. It comes at a time when the government, for the first time in over 40 years, has introduced amendments to the Police Act, Bill 107, recognizing that policing is indeed a service. I appeal to all members of this House to make this bill a priority and ensure its passage in this session. I fully recognize that legislation alone will not change things overnight, but let us remember that with this law we would accomplish a major step forward.

As I said at the very outset, this, combined with our sense of tolerance and understanding on all fronts, will realize our goals of ensuring racial harmony in our country where freedom and justice reign.

BIOMEDICAL WASTE DISPOSAL

Mrs Grier: Two weeks ago the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues admitted that she had mailed out a lot of empty envelopes. The Ministry of Energy has the opposite problem. Last week it mailed me a cheque for \$50,000. Alas, it was not made out to me. It was for the chemical and industrial division of Kilborn engineering company in my riding. I have delivered the cheque and was grateful for the opportunity to have, as they say on the government side, a photo op.

What is really important is what the \$50,000 was for. It was part of the Ministry of Energy's contribution to a feasibility study for an energy-from-waste co-generation hospital laundry system for northern Ontario. The study demonstrates that it is feasible to use biomedical waste from several hospitals to generate energy which can be used to run a laundry system. The study has now been submitted to the Ministry of Health with a request for approval and funding.

This proposal has a great deal of merit. Energy from waste is not one of my favourite programs, but incineration of biomedical waste does make sense. Obtaining energy by co-generation is something I heartily endorse. Reducing the cost of hospital laundry facilities is beneficial to the environment as it encourages use of non-disposable items, and promoting industry in northern Ontario is something my party has always promoted.

I appreciate the support from the Ministry of Energy. Now that the proposal has entered the labyrinth of the Ministry of Health, is there any chance it will ever be seen again? I hope so. And if anyone wants to send me his or her cheque, I will be glad to deliver it.

CAPITAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS

Mr Jackson: As a direct result of the Liberal government's failure to plan for growth, 200,000 children are studying in 7,500 portables this year. Even though a crisis in school accommodation exists today, this government has put a cap on school building funds which will not be spent until 1993-94.

Now we have two clear examples that old habits die hard. The government has recently announced the Seaton and Harbourfront development proposals without consultation, let alone providing for the educational needs of children.

The Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs did not consult with the Durham Board of Education before his 29 March Seaton press conference. The board estimates that \$50 million will be needed to build 23 elementary and secondary schools if Seaton grows to the forecast population of 90,000 in 25 years. If the board's needs are not considered, we will once again have new subdivisions with no schools.

Education was also overlooked in the announcement at Harbourfront. Currently more than 300 children who live on the waterfront are being bused to seven different schools. Toronto school board officials sent a report to Duncan Allan asking for 3.5 acres of land for a school. In return, the province has offered 1.5 acres to be shared with a community centre on land that the federal government owns and wishes to protect.

Unless the Liberals learn to consult with the educational community about the capital requirements, our children can look forward to a future of portables and busing in Ontario.

FOOD BANKS

Mr Daigeler: Last week the Ottawa Citizen reported that the expected increase at emergency food centres has not materialized.

Judy Arnold, the co-ordinator of the Emergency Food and Clothing Centre on Bank Street, had this to say: "The emergency service providers met last week and the message was that most of us are stable or down a little bit and we certainly are prepared to give government credit."

The Gloucester Emergency Food Board is reporting a 25% drop in demand in April compared with March; the Parkdale Food Centre is reporting a decline of 23%; the Dalhousie Food Action Group is reporting a 12% drop in demand in April compared with April 1989; and the Caldwell Family Centre is

reporting a 20% decline in demand during February, March and April of this year compared with the same months last year. Even the head of the Ottawa Food Bank said the demand from food centres—which rely on the bank for some of their food—is down.

These results are very impressive and exactly what the government had hoped for with its \$415-million social assistance reforms last year. As the previous chairman of the Liberal caucus committee on social development, I am very pleased to note the success of these reforms and to congratulate the Premier and his cabinet on their commitment to social justice.

VISITOR

The Speaker: Just before I call the next order, I would like to inform the members that we have a special visitor in the lower west gallery, a gentleman who may be familiar to some, but I am sure he is very familiar with this chamber. He served here from 1943 to 1953, I think, and in that time was Leader of the Opposition. I would like you to join me in welcoming Ted Jolliffe.

ORAL QUESTIONS

POLICE LEGISLATION

Mr B. Rae: In view of the absence of the Premier and the Attorney General, I will have to stand down one question, but I do have a question for the Solicitor General.

After the shooting of Marlon Neal some two days ago, the question is still very much alive as to why it is that the government has not moved in those areas where it could move without requiring a change in the Criminal Code and blaming the Tories in Ottawa for not doing that.

I want to ask the minister why there have been no changes in the regulations with respect to two particular recommendations made by the task force over a year ago; one with respect to the use of force, and he knows there is a very specific regulation which the commission recommended be changed. He also knows that it was a recommendation of the commission that there should be a new disciplinary offence of racially prejudiced behaviour.

These are two particular instances where the government could have moved and could still move today if it decided that is what it wanted to do. Why has the government not moved in these two areas?

1350

Hon Mr Offer: I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition brings up a very important point and talks of two very important issues. But I think it just brings to the floor the understanding, of course, that there are many more issues that must be addressed. The government has addressed many of those issues in a comprehensive fashion.

We believe there is the necessity for a new Police Services Act in this province. As the honourable Leader of the Opposition will know, the last Police Act was passed in 1949. There is no one who will deny that the province of 1990 is much different from that of 1949 and that we require a new Police Services Act—a comprehensive approach to policing in the province; in fact, what is a constitution of policing—which has in fact been introduced, not only to be introduced but also to be passed so that many of these particular issues will be addressed.

Mr B. Rae: The minister knows full well that there is in place now a Police Act. He knows full well that there is a

regulation—regulation 790, section 9 and section 9(a)—dated August 1989, issued under the regulations of the province of Ontario. He knows full well that these are the guidelines which are now in force for the police officers of this province. He also knows that over a year ago a commission established by his government said these regulations were not appropriate for the 1990s and needed to be changed and clarified so that the question of when a police officer should even draw his gun would be clearer to everyone, especially to the police.

The minister had that recommendation over a year ago. It deals with regulations which the minister could have introduced over a year ago without even coming to this House for approval. Why would he not have changed the regulation over a year ago, when he had the power and the authority and the ability to do so? Why not?

Hon Mr Offer: In dealing with the whole question of the use of force, I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition will recognize not only that there is that part of the regulation under the current Police Act but that there is a difficulty which falls under section 25, subsection 4, of the Canadian Criminal Code.

We recognize that difficulty. We have addressed that difficulty by having the Attorney General of this province petition the federal government for a change in the Criminal Code so that there can be a consistency and so that police officers will have an understanding in dealing with the whole question of use of force.

We are addressing not only the use of force issue through a change in the Criminal Code and the petitioning for a change under section 25, subsection 4, but also in the training and retraining of officers in the use of firearms. Those are two areas dealing with firearms which we have not only recognized but have in fact addressed.

Mr B. Rae: The Premier of the province gives platitudes. He has been talking platitudes for over two years, not providing the leadership that is required. The government writes a letter to Ottawa and says, "We would like you to move on the Criminal Code," and the government is not even prepared to amend its own regulations when it comes to the use of force. The minister's government has no credibility on this issue; none at all.

Why would the minister think Ottawa would take him seriously with respect to changing the Criminal Code on the question of the use of force when he has not even changed his own regulations when it is in his power exclusively—not ours, not the Tory party's; his exclusively—to deal with this question of the use of force? That is the minister's responsibility, and he has yet to move in an area where he has the power to do so.

Hon Mr Offer: The Leader of the Opposition talks about platitudes and I talk about action. We had a task force report on race relations and policing, a task force which travelled the province, listening to people's concerns about the relationship between the police officers and the communities. That particular report was prepared, and it uncovered very important areas. We have addressed those areas. We agree with the direction of the report. We have introduced a new Police Services Act which addresses many of those concerns.

We have also talked about the issue of training and retraining. We are currently developing new course content in the training and retraining of police officers as well as how those areas are to be delivered, and we are also continuing on with public forums across this province where police representatives

and where members of the community discuss matters of concern, what they are and how they can be addressed.

These three areas, I respectfully suggest, are areas of action which we are continuing—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Do you still wish to stand down the question? New question, the member for Parry Sound.

Mr Eves: I might ask that we stand down both our leader's questions because neither the Premier nor the Attorney General, to whom they are to be directed, is here at this time.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to have the two stood down?

Agreed to.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr Mackenzie: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. The minister will be aware that on Monday a provincial court judge decided not to prosecute the Minister of Health and her officials on charges stemming from the fatal crash of an air ambulance in the Windsor area. The minister might remember that three people—the pilot, an attendant and a passenger—were killed on 24 June 1989 when the air ambulance crashed off Pelee Island into Lake Erie.

The attendant, Russ Ransom, had safety concerns but could not refuse unsafe work even if he wanted to. The Occupational Health and Safety Act does not allow care givers to refuse unsafe work if, in the language of the act, "circumstances are such that the life, health or safety of another person or the public may be in imminent jeopardy." The irony in last June's air crash is that the safety of the worker and of members of the public was put at risk.

Given the judge's decision—the courts are no help to the workers—is it not even more obvious to the minister that public sector workers need the right to refuse unsafe work?

Hon Mr Phillips: I think all of us recognize there is the need to balance the need for our employees, particularly those who are involved in public safety, to protect the public but at the same time not to unnecessarily put themselves at risk. During the debate on Bill 208, it was one of the issues that I think was perhaps most widely brought to the committee. It is an area that we continue to look at as to how we balance those two responsibilities.

I will tell the member that we are looking at opportunities for helping our employees to ensure that they are not unnecessarily put at risk at the same time as we ensure that the public safety is looked after in policing, health, corrections and fire matters. I want to assure the members that we are looking at opportunities for improving that element of ensuring that our workers are not put unnecessarily at risk and, as we move forward with the debate on Bill 208, I hope we will have some opportunity to debate that further.

Mr Mackenzie: The only refusal in this situation is that of the Liberal government. Even in its proposed amendments to the Occupational Health and Safety Act, public sector workers would still not have the right to refuse; they are exempted under the act. Can the minister assure this House and the people of Ontario that these public sector workers will have the right to protect themselves and the public by refusing what is obviously unsafe work when they can recognize the situation?

Hon Mr Phillips: Just to clarify one small point the member made, our public sector workers do have the right to refuse to do unsafe work, with several exceptions as opposed to all of them. Just to clarify that, the exceptions are correctional officers and individuals involved in fire protection and police protection.

Having said all that in terms of clarification, I want to assure the House that during the debate on Bill 208 it was one of those issues that was raised consistently at the committee. During the committee debates we made several amendments, as the member is aware, responding to the delegations that came to the committee.

This is one area we continue to look at, whether there are opportunities for us to improve for our public sector workers their own safety and their right to refuse to do unnecessarily dangerous work at the same time as we protect the public's interest. I want to assure the House, as I said earlier, that we are looking at that opportunity. As we move forward on Bill 208, it is my hope that we will be able to find some way of balancing those two key needs.

1400

The Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition may wish to ask his first question to the Premier.

Mr B. Rae: I understand that the Attorney General is coming. I just want to wait until he comes.

POLICE LEGISLATION

Mr Eves: I have a question for the Premier. He is quoted in the media today as saying that he needs the co-operation of the Conservative Party and New Democrats to help get the Police Services Act through. As he is undoubtedly aware—I see he is talking to his House leader—I have sent his House leader a letter today. Being more than co-operative, we are prepared to deal with second reading of Bill 107 in this Legislature this afternoon and to send the bill out for public hearings to the standing committee on administration of justice through the month of June, so that this important piece of legislation can be enacted before the House rises for the summer recess. Will the Premier acquiesce to that request we have made today?

Hon Mr Peterson: I thank the honourable member for his very constructive suggestion, and I think indeed therein are the seeds of some very constructive action.

The House leader had just shown me the member's letter prior to the member standing on his feet to address the question to me. I responded to the House leader that I think we should sit down immediately with the House leaders and try to work the matter out.

As members know, there is a bill in the House at the present time. I think we can work around this. We can certainly sit tonight. I think that would be a very fine gesture on the part of the Conservative members and the opposition to deal with this matter. I think with any luck we may be able to get, say, second reading through by tomorrow. We are happy to work with members in that regard and get it into a committee next week.

Mr Eves: The Premier knows very well that there is no need for the Legislature to sit tonight or any other night. It is his government's prerogative to call any piece of legislation it wants at any time it wants.

I would just like to take the Premier through a short chronology of events surrounding Bill 107. In April 1986 the Solicitor General, the member for Kingston and The Islands, said a new police act would be in the Legislature by June 1986.

In August 1988 Lester Donaldson died. I introduced a private member's resolution in October 1988 asking the Premier to refer this matter to the standing committee on administration of justice then. Wade Lawson was shot in December 1988. The Premier finally got around to appointing a task force after Lawson's death. The task force reported in April 1989.

The then Solicitor General, the member for London South, said the new act would be in the House by May 1989. The new act was introduced by the current Solicitor General on 20 December 1989, just before we rose for the winter break. Nothing has happened since then.

Marlon Neal was shot. Now the Premier wants to do it all of a sudden. Where has he been since 1986?

Hon Mr Peterson: My honourable friend would like to turn this into a partisan issue and he has every right to do that. My honourable friend stands in outrage in this House. He is aware of the filibuster that has gone on in this House for the past 28 days. I say to him that the police act is a significant piece of legislation, as my honourable friend would be aware; I think it makes the first major amendments in some 50 years.

I welcome the member's invitation to deal with this expeditiously. I am sure, given the thoughtful, conciliatory person he is, that we can work out a way among the House leaders to deal with that bill expeditiously and accomplish a lot of our other work at the same time.

Mr Eves: We have made an offer. He can do his committee of the whole on Bill 68 tomorrow. He can get third reading the day the House comes back on 28 May. He can get his bill then. Is providing billions of dollars to insurance companies by this Friday more important to the Premier than dealing with this piece of legislation in this House this afternoon? Yes or no.

Hon Mr Peterson: Let me tell the honourable member how much I admire his new-found conscience, but I know, with his conciliatory nature, we can deal with this matter. We accept his offer to sit this afternoon and this evening, and we can accomplish both bills. We appreciate his help in the matter.

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mrs Cunningham: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. The minister is very much aware of the violence in our schools that we are all concerned about. We admit that we have an increased amount of tragedies and incidents in the last few years. Principals and teachers are being forced to spend their time consulting with these young people and trying to reach out to their families in the interest of prevention and sometimes treatment, for which they do not have the facilities or the support.

It is obvious at the same time that other young people are missing out on quality education because some of our trained professionals are spending their time with some of the more difficult young people to serve. Many of these children in fact cannot be managed in our behavioural classes and they are referred to children's mental health centres, for which they are put on to waiting lists.

My question is this: With all the tragedy we are watching in society today, with the understanding we have about prevention and how it works, why are we allowing these long waiting lists to continue on with no direct action on behalf of the government at this point in time?

Hon Mr Beer: I am glad to have the opportunity to reassure the honourable member that indeed we are taking a num-

ber of specific steps which I think are going to have an impact on those waiting lists.

The honourable member would be interested to know that at the meeting I had with the Ontario executive of the children's mental health centres, we agreed upon a number of initiatives that we were going to undertake jointly; some of those dealt with the wage problems within the sector. As the honourable member knows, we have increased the base funding to 5.5% and we have also set out \$58 million, some of which will be going to salaries in that sector.

Particularly important in terms of the waiting list, I have taken on within my own ministry an individual who is working directly with centres, looking at the lists themselves and to what extent help is available within the community to help those young people through other centres. We are looking, in addition, at the professionals who are working in the children's mental health centres, together with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health, around the specific problem of maintaining key professionals within that sector.

All of this is going forward in the context of the report which I will be receiving next month on the whole children's services sector. I have told the children's mental health executive that once I receive that report, I will be meeting with it to see what other steps we can take to ensure that we have the care needed for our young people.

Mrs Cunningham: I am very much aware of the work that is being done by an individual travelling across Ontario. I think I also feel fairly confident, as do school boards, that the referrals they are making to the children's mental health centres are of ultimate concern to them and of great priority. Many of these parents have to be talked into dealing with the referral itself, sometimes for six months and up to two years, before they will even seek the help.

When this list is made available, I am confident that many of these young people should be dealt with immediately. Will the minister be reporting back to this House what percentage of the list deals with young people in school systems that will be dealt with immediately and how he is going to do it by the end of June?

Hon Mr Beer: I would like to add as well that I am specifically aware of the problems that school boards are facing. I have talked with a number of members of the board, senior officials, about what they are seeing within the school system, and in a couple of areas we are working very co-operatively in terms of community and social services with those boards to try to ensure that the care is there when required.

I can give a commitment to the honourable member that as I have the information, I will be more than happy to make that available to her and to the House. I want to assure her that we take this whole area as one of a very prime concern and initiative where we really have to move to ensure that the young people who need care get it.

1410

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr Daigeler: My question is to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. The minister knows of my keen interest in the future of our college system and whether our community colleges effectively prepare our young people for the business world of tomorrow.

In this regard, I am wondering about a proposal by the committee of parliamentary assistants for small business that individuals from business and industry be recruited to teach at

the various levels of schooling. I understand that this idea is already being implemented by some colleges. Can the minister report on how widespread this practice is and whether it is achieving its purpose of bringing together the business and education sectors?

Hon Mr Conway: I thank my honourable friend for the question. He is right that it is a well-established practice within the college community that a number of teachers, particularly in the business and commerce area, are recruited directly from the world of business and commerce. As the college system looks to a substantial renewal of its professoriate over the next decade, I expect that this trend will in fact accelerate.

Mr Daigeler: Further to the point of involving business in training, I read with great dismay, I must say, in the 25 April edition of the Financial Post that 75% of Canadian employers provide no formal training at all for employees. There is a gaping discrepancy between heavy investment in equipment and machinery by industry and its failure to invest in education, training and skills. Can the minister bring us up to date on the government's efforts to have business assume its responsibility for training?

Hon Mr Conway: As the member will know, the Premier's Council on technology has been examining a number of proposals over the last number of months. We are looking forward, I say to my friend the member for Nepean, to a report from the council in the very near future that will provide a range of policy options.

I can tell my friend that as we look to the future, there is no question that the business community is going to have to increase its investment, and in some cases it is going to have to increase its investment substantially, particularly in terms of long-term training. The government is very anxious to work with business and with labour to ensure that the human resource needs of the Ontario economy are well and fully met over the next number of years.

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Mr B. Rae: I have a question to the Minister of Citizenship. I am sure the minister will be aware that the Alliance for Employment Equity, the Urban Alliance on Race Relations, the Ontario Visible Minority Women's Coalition and the Congress of Black Women of Canada, Ontario Region have all had not just one or two but several meetings with members of his cabinet, with his cabinet colleagues over several years. Indeed, they are still working on a five-year-old promise from the Liberal Party of Ontario that there will be legislation dealing with employment equity in the private sector and in the public sector.

These groups are increasingly frustrated because, while they are quite happy to attend meetings, they have been led to believe that these meetings will be followed by an actual piece of legislation from this government. I wonder whether the minister can tell us, where this piece of legislation is. Are we going to see it before the end of this session?

[Interruption]

The Speaker: Order. We are glad to have visitors. However, the standing orders say that visitors must not participate in any way or demonstrate in any way. Otherwise, they will have to leave.

Hon Mr Wong: I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for that very important question. The government is

quite aware that there are many groups, many people who are visible minorities, people with disabilities, women or aboriginal people who have been disadvantaged over the years and are seeking access and equity in terms of hiring and promotion.

I wish to assure the honourable member and the members of the House that this is one of the priorities that we have been working on. I can assure the honourable member that in due course—we are working as expeditiously as possible—I hope to be able to announce employment equity initiatives that will cover the broader public sector and the private sector for Ontario.

Mr B. Rae: "In due course" is not good enough, and the minister surely knows that by now. He will know that, out of the population in Ontario, half the people who are disabled make less than \$10,000 a year. He will know that the unemployment rate for some groups of disabled is as high as 60% and 70%. He knows that.

Now these groups, native people, disabled people, people of colour from all over the province, have been told. They have been told by the Attorney General, they have been told by the minister's predecessor, they have been told by the Premier that something is coming. They were told in 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1989, and now the minister is telling them in 1990 that, in due course, something will come.

Why is the minister making these people wait, the most vulnerable citizens of this province? Why does the minister not have a program in place and legislation in place before the end of this session?

Hon Mr Wong: I wish to remind the honourable member that in order to come up with the most effective employment equity initiative for the broader public sector and the private sector of the province, the government, my predecessor and myself, engaged in consultation with 100 or more of the specific groups that were particularly interested in making sure that these initiatives would be done effectively.

I wish to assure the honourable member and the House that those consultations have been completed, that I have personally been taking the implementation proposals through the cabinet process with my various cabinet colleagues. So when I say "in due process," I am being very specific with the honourable member in letting him know that progress is being made.

NURSING EDUCATION

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities. The minister will be aware that there is a severe and chronic shortage of nurses in Ontario, especially intensive care nurses. He will also be familiar with a Toronto Star article recently which reported on staff vacancy rates in Toronto of 9.7%, some 1,274 positions that are left wanting for nursing positions.

Is the minister aware that the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute nursing program, its new entry program, has been cut from 80 placements down to 35 placements as a direct result of Liberal policies for funding? Why is it that a post-secondary institution in Ontario is reducing by over half the new entrance enrolments to a nursing program at a time of severe shortage for intensive care nurses in Ontario?

Hon Mr Conway: The honourable member will know that this government's support of our post-secondary institutions, and particularly its support of a number of the health science programs, has been very good. Certainly it is the responsibility of individual universities, Ryerson or colleges to manage their

own budgets in a way that their boards determine both appropriate and desirable.

I am not going to debate, on the floor of this assembly, the particulars of management decisions taken by any particular one of our post-secondary institutions. I certainly do not share the honourable member's assessment of the overall picture and I repeat that, in respect of overall support and particularly in the area of health sciences education, in the main, the government's support has been very good indeed.

Mr Jackson: I am not asking the minister to debate this issue. I am asking him to participate in some human resource planning that is critical to the health needs of the citizens of the province.

Just this week in this House the case was brought to the minister's attention of an Ajax baby who could not be admitted to a fully equipped neonatal centre in Toronto because there were no additional trained intensive care nurses available. In this city, at the Hospital for Sick Children, 242 children have had their heart operations postponed because of a lack of intensive care nurses.

The minister himself, along with the Minister of Health, sits on the planning and priorities committee of cabinet specifically with the responsibility of planning human resources in this province. So I do not ask him to debate; I ask him to participate. Why is the minister not working directly with the Minister of Health to ensure that there are sufficient spaces in our educational institutions to educate enough intensive care nurses to meet the needs in this province?

Hon Mr Conway: I can tell my honourable friend that I am working very closely with my colleague the Minister of Health in these and other matters. Since taking office, the number of nursing students in both our community college and our university programs has increased very considerably. In fact, if the honourable member wants, I am more than willing to share with him the particular nature of those increases. But I repeat that over the last number of years the enrolments in both the college and the university nursing programs have increased, and increased significantly.

1420

POLICE COMMISSION NOMINATION

Mr B. Rae: I have a question to the Attorney General. This is the first opportunity I have had to ask the Attorney General questions arising from the letter that he wrote to the Solicitor General with respect to the nomination of Mr DelZotto to the Ontario Police Commission.

In this House on 26 June—the Attorney General will no doubt recall because he was, I believe, in the House—the Premier, sitting just two seats down from him and referring to the nomination of Mr DelZotto, said, “The Attorney General...was not in favour of the situation and neither was I.” On June 27 the Premier said, “nor was there any recommendation from the Attorney General on that matter....The only record we have of that is a letter from Mrs Starr to the Attorney General.”

I want to ask the Attorney General very directly, at the time the Premier made those comments, was the Attorney General aware of the letter he had signed which said, “I trust that you will give this nomination every consideration when a position becomes vacant”?

Hon Mr Scott: I think the answer to the question is no. The honourable member will recall that, when the matter was

raised in the House over a year ago, it was disclosed that I had received a request from the National Council of Jewish Women of Canada to support the recommendation of Mr DelZotto. It was disclosed in the House that I had received that letter. I did not recall that I had written the letter to the member for Kingston and The Islands.

I should explain to the honourable member that the word “recommendation” is not used in the letter at all. I receive, over the course of a year, hundreds of letters from organizations like the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women and members of the NDP that persons be recommended for various positions. If they—

Interjection.

Hon Mr Scott: The member for Welland-Thorold should not forget his letters. If those letters come to me when they should more appropriately go to another minister who is responsible for the appointment, I send them on. The tone of that letter—which I have now seen, and there are probably dozens of a similar type—was that fair consideration should be given to the application.

I would make the same request of a fellow minister in respect of an appointment proposed by the National Action Committee for the Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues or when a person who has been refused a workers' compensation application asks me to write to the chairman of the board: that every consideration be given to the request. That is what I did in this case.

Mr B. Rae: There are letters and there are letters. The concern I have is that with respect to the appointment of Mr DelZotto, the Premier stated in the House last year when we questioned him over a number of days and when the Premier was questioned outside—indeed when the Attorney General was questioned—that he was never in favour of the application and that indeed, if I can quote again from what the Premier said, “The Attorney General...was not in favour of the situation and neither was I.”

A commonsense approach to this would lead one to ask, if the Attorney General was not in favour of the nomination of Mr DelZotto to the Ontario Police Commission, why did he not reflect that view at that time when writing to his cabinet colleague the Solicitor General, who was responsible for the appointment? If he was not in favour of the appointment and he did not think it was a good idea or, to use the words he used last year, he did not “think it was appropriate in all the circumstances,” why would he not have said that in his letter? In fact, why would he have said what could fairly be described as something quite different?

Hon Mr Scott: The honourable member will recall that when I received the letter, which is a letter that should have been sent to the Solicitor General, who recommends that appointment in the primary case, I transmitted it on in the letter that is described. I want to tell the honourable member that what we said in the House is accurate, that in the following week I considered the matter, was briefed about it by my staff and I attended on the Premier on 13 May, I believe to be the date, and recommended that no consideration should be given to the appointment of Mr DelZotto to this particular position. The Premier heard me out. That represented his view, he accepted my recommendation and the appointment was not proceeded with.

Mr B. Rae: The fact that the appointment was not proceeded with is obviously a matter of record. We all know

that. The issue is, it is not for a lack of an effort by Mrs Starr and it is not because of anything which is on paper. The only piece of paper that we have in addition to the letter from Mrs Starr, I say with great respect to the Attorney General and to the Premier—different from what they told us last year, and I accept the answer—

Hon Mr Scott: No, no, no.

Mr B. Rae: Either way, a letter is a letter. A letter is there. We were told there was one letter. There are two letters on file—not just one; there are two. There is a second letter on file, the letter from the Attorney General; it has his signature on it. He could not remember that letter last year; this year he remembers the letter. I accept that explanation.

The question that I have for the Attorney General is quite simple. I would like to ask him again whether he is saying, when he said, “I trust that you will give this nomination every consideration when a position becomes vacant,” that on second thought and after receiving other information or after discussing it with other people, he then decided to change his mind and ask that the nomination not be given every consideration when a position becomes vacant, which is the position he took on paper?

Hon Mr Scott: Making bricks out of straw is a very difficult job, but it is what opposition leaders have to do. I am prepared to justify to this House or anywhere else appointments that the government has made. But when I recommended in a meeting on 13 May against an appointment and the appointment was not made, I do not think we should be treated as if in fact it was made, which is what the opposition leader wants to do. But, as I say, making bricks out of straw is the member opposite's job.

The Speaker: The member for Leeds-Grenville. Is this a leadoff question?

Mr Runciman: Yes, it is, Mr Speaker, to the Attorney General and what he suggests is straw. I think it is important, in respect to the Attorney General's response to the initial question from the Leader of the Opposition when he responded that he was not aware of this other letter, that he had signed this letter and sent this letter.

I find that rather curious with respect to the fact that he is telling us today he has specific dates of meeting with the Premier, discussing this issue with the Premier and making a recommendation against the appointment of Mr DelZotto. This was a significant issue in this Legislature, and I am wondering if the minister could expand upon the reasons why he was at that point in time unaware of the letter that went out under his signature.

Hon Mr Scott: I have made inquiries, and the honourable member will be interested to know that I receive, on average, 150 letters a day. Many of them are letters from national or provincial organizations, often individuals requesting that so-and-so be nominated to a particular position in the government. They come from opposition leaders and from members of the opposition as well as our own caucus. In this case it came from the Toronto branch of a national organization.

We acknowledge the letter and if it does not relate to an appointment within the purview of the Ministry of the Attorney General, we pass it on to the appropriate minister and ask that it be fairly considered. That is what we did within two days. I do not recall seeing the letter and that, frankly, is not a matter of surprise because hundreds of them are sent every year as a result of the questions that come to us—150 a day.

However, when we received the letter, in the succeeding week we gave serious consideration to the proposal and I decided that it was my responsibility to recommend against the nomination that the National Council of Jewish Women had made. I arranged an appointment with the Premier and I did that. We recommended against the appointment—“recommend,” a word that is not in the letter—and that recommendation was agreed to by the Premier and accepted.

1430

Mr Runciman: I think it is passing strange we have the Premier saying clearly on the record in Hansard that the only record we have of that is a letter in respect to a recommendation; the only record we have is a letter from Mrs Starr to the Attorney General. We are talking about an issue where we have the Premier of the province getting up and indicating to the Legislature that we only have a letter from Mrs Starr and then when this is revealed to the public, we find a three-day turnaround. Is the Attorney General suggesting that every request he gets receives that same kind of attention? It has a three-day turnaround from receipt of the letter from Mrs Starr and a letter going to the member for Kingston and The Islands, the then Solicitor General, supporting that recommendation. Is that the normal course of events in the minister's office?

Hon Mr Scott: I could not dare pretend in the presence of my friends and colleagues in all parties and in the presence of the honourable member for Orangeville that a three-day turnaround is my standard. But I want to say that a three-day turnaround is my standard when the recommendation comes to the wrong minister, because then I send it on to the appropriate minister, which was in fact what was done in this case.

I just want to add something to the honourable member's question. If the government had made this appointment, it would be a legitimate question to say to me, “The Attorney General may be responsible that this appointment has been made.” But this is an appointment that was never made, and the Premier and I have explained the circumstances in which it was never made. We will stand behind appointments that we have made. It is surely not fair to ask us to answer for appointments that we refused to make and recommended against. This is Alice in Wonderland.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Would anyone want to view it from here?

Mr Runciman: The Attorney General talks about Alice in Wonderland. Perhaps he should stop telling this House fairy tales, because who is going to buy what he is telling us? We are not talking about the fact that Mr DelZotto did not get the appointment; we are all much aware of that. What we are talking about is the integrity of the Attorney General. We are talking about the Premier getting up in this House and saying that the only letter in respect of support of this was from Mrs Starr.

James Dubro spoke to the then Solicitor General in May in respect to this appointment and was told by him that he was getting pressure from the Attorney General's office. We are talking about the credibility of the Attorney General in respect to this, or the credibility of the government. Certainly when the heat fell in respect to Patti Starr, they all backed away from it quickly.

We want to know why the Attorney General did not reveal to the House last June that he wrote this letter in support of that recommendation.

Hon Mr Scott: It is important to recognize that I revealed to the House that I had received a letter from the National Council of Jewish Women and that we had made a recommendation on 13 May to the Premier, which we did. I have told the Leader of the Opposition that I had forgotten that we had sent that letter. It is a transmittal letter that was sent in hundreds of cases. I am not backing away from it; I am simply saying it does not recommend anybody for anything. What it does is it asks that an applicant proposed by the National Council of Jewish Women be given every consideration.

As I said, if the Leeds and Grenville association of rural municipalities wrote in asking if we would consider Mr So-and-so for the tile drainage board—I do not appoint members to the tile drainage board, yet—I would immediately write a letter to the Minister of Agriculture and Food and say, "I have received this request; would you give it every consideration?" just as when someone who is having trouble with the Workers' Compensation Board writes in and says he has not been able to get a hearing and I write to the board and say, "I have received this letter; will you give it every consideration?" That is what I did in this case. We then reviewed the matter—

Mr Sterling: Why do you bother?

Hon Mr Scott: The honourable member says, "Why do we bother?" If I did not respond to his letters in that way, he would be offended.

Mr Sterling: Why do you bother if they don't mean anything? They don't mean anything.

The Speaker: Order. Just so the members are aware, we are back to the usual routine of rotation.

RENTAL HOUSING PROTECTION

Mr Faubert: My question is of the Minister of Housing. Tenants of Brimell Court, which is a rental townhouse complex in my riding, are quite concerned about the action of their landlord. This is a continuing action of his because for as yet unstated reasons and, I think, reasons we can only guess at, when tenants vacate a unit, it is boarded up and left vacant. In essence, a very cohesive community is being slowly closed down, one unit at a time.

When the Rental Housing Protection Act was passed in 1986, it appeared to me, as well as to others in their interpretation, that the incentives for a landlord to leave a unit vacant in the hope of and to facilitate future rezoning for redevelopment was removed from that act. Can the minister explain how the Rental Housing Protection Act will effectively curtail the ability of the landlord to redevelop this site, even if all the units were to become vacant?

Hon Mr Sweeney: There is nothing in our legislation that requires a landlord to rerent a unit. He or she can choose to leave it empty. But the legislation with respect to rental housing protection is very clear that no action may be taken to convert rental units, whether they are occupied or whether they are vacant, into anything else. No action may be taken to demolish a rental unit, whether it is occupied or not. That action can only be taken with the approval of the local municipal council, and it would be on the basis that there were structural faults or that certain maintenance would be required that could not be done while the unit is vacant.

Mr Faubert: I am sure that response will provide some assurances to the tenants. But there have been numerous property standard violations on this property over the years which have generally gone unheeded.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr Faubert: They have been unheeded by the landlord in spite of numerous orders to comply issued by the city of Scarborough. Can the minister advise that House—

Hon Mr Sweeney: I cannot hear what he is saying.

The Speaker: Neither can I. I cannot hear a thing other than confusion. Let us start all over again and remember standing order 20(b).

Mr Faubert: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am glad to see that the opposition has no interest in the tenants of this province.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I asked the member for a supplementary. Will he place it?

Mr Faubert: Could the minister advise how future rent increases could be stayed by the legislation or even forfeited if property standard violation orders are not complied with?

Hon Mr Sweeney: Clearly, when the local municipality orders that certain maintenance work be done and it is not done, we have the Residential Rental Standards Board within the legislation to deal with that. As a matter of fact, in this particular situation an order has been extended as of 1 May of this year requiring those maintenance orders to be complied with, and during the period of time from 1 May to 30 May, any rent increases would be suspended. If the work is not completed as of 31 May, then not only is the rent increase suspended but it is forfeited until the work is done. Finally, there is a provision to go directly to the court, which would result not only in suspension or forfeiture but actually in a decrease in the rent. So there are several legal mechanisms to deal with this situation and they are in play right at the present time.

1440

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr Farnan: I have a question for the Minister of Health. In the Speaker's gallery today are Chris and Jim Remnant of Cambridge and their eight-year-old daughter Lindsay. Lindsay suffers from a condition called syringomyelia, a condition related to spina bifida.

The magnetic resonance imaging treatment that Lindsay requires has an outpatient waiting list of up to eight months, and Dr Hoffman, chief of neurosurgery at the Hospital for Sick Children, is of the opinion that if Lindsay does not get the treatment she requires when she requires it, she will be permanently paralysed, meaning she would become a quadriplegic.

How can the government justify a system where patients are hospitalized at Sick Children's hospital at a cost of \$790 a bed per day for up to three weeks as they await MRI treatment, where access to treatment is achieved only by bumping another patient down the waiting list and where families like the Remnants are sometimes forced to travel to Buffalo for treatment for their daughter?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I am not familiar with the specific case the member raises. I would be pleased to look into it and to see what alternatives might be available so that the family can have the choices and information made available to them.

Mr Farnan: Perhaps I can help the minister. The ministry has approved five new MRI units. However, a budget of \$200,000 per hospital for the operation of these machines is

inadequate. In effect, this amount will only cover the cost of running the machines one day a week.

It is critical in the treatment of this condition that the MRI be available without delay, otherwise children like Lindsay may lose the physical skills they still have available to them. Will the minister give a commitment to this House that she will fully fund the operation of the MRI unit proposed at the Hospital for Sick Children and reassess and re-evaluate the funding for MRI services in the other approved hospitals?

Hon Mrs Caplan: The member is referring to the huge expansion of magnetic resonance imaging capability in this province. I want him to know that in fact Ontario is in the forefront in making sure that we review the effectiveness of new technologies. When it is proven effective, then we are looking at the dissemination of that technology in a rational way.

We have approved magnetic resonance imaging for all the health science centres in this province and the ministry is at the present time working with those health science centres which will be establishing new magnetic resonance imaging machines and services, including the one at Sick Children's Hospital to make sure it is implemented in a way which is appropriate.

POLICE COMMISSION NOMINATION

Mr Runciman: I have a question for the Premier related to the matter we were just discussing with the Attorney General earlier this afternoon. He indicated to the media at some point earlier this week that he was not going to pursue this matter further in respect of following it up. I think that was the general intent of his comments, at least as they were reported in the media.

We contacted people at the Globe and Mail today to ask them for a copy of the letter and they indicated they were not going to make it available to us; they were not going to make it available to anyone. They indicated they had had a call from the Office of the Premier asking for a copy of that letter.

I am just wondering if the Premier would explain to the House why his office would be asking for a copy of that letter.

Hon Mr Peterson: It may have been that somebody called for it, because we have not seen the letter. My friend the Attorney General tells me he has not seen the letter, but we read about it in the newspapers. That is where we found out about it.

Mr Runciman: This gets curiouser and curiouser. We are talking about the Premier not having seen this letter and the Attorney General not having seen this letter. That makes one wonder, where are the files?

This is a very controversial issue. This has been a very controversial issue and we are being told that no one has a copy of this letter other than the Globe and Mail. I think we require in this assembly a much fuller explanation in respect to where this letter came from. Why is there no copy of it in the files? I think that is a very important ingredient of this. Will the Premier try to respond?

Hon Mr Peterson: Mr Speaker, my friend is really reaching here, and I understand. Believe me, I understand political desperation. I do. He has my utmost sympathy. I read about the letter in the newspaper. Obviously, it was not in my files. If it were in anybody's files, it would be in the then Solicitor General's files. I was not aware of it. The Attorney General has told the member his sense of the situation. If it exists, it exists. Now maybe the member should file a freedom-of-information

on the Globe and Mail. That is what he should do, and find out if they are telling the whole story there.

Hon R. F. Nixon: Somebody down there is going to brown envelope that letter and we are all going to have a look at it.

RENT REVIEW

Ms Poole: My question is for the Minister of Housing. I have had a number of calls from constituents this week who are deeply concerned that the new Conservative leader, the member for Nipissing, has called for the end of rent control protections.

Hon Mr Bradley: What's that? Say that again.

The Speaker: Order.

Ms Poole: My constituents would like the reassurance of this government that we do not intend to end rent—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I did not hear the question. Did the minister hear the question or not?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I believe, and the honourable member can corroborate if I am correct, she asked, "Does this government have any intention of eliminating the rent review process in Ontario?" Was that the question? I think it was.

As my colleagues have suggested, I think my answer might appeal to others in the opposition as well. Let me say that this government has no intention of reducing protection for tenants. As a matter of fact, I think the actions of this government clearly demonstrate that, because it was this government that expanded rent review protection to cover all buildings built after 1976. It was this government that brought in the Rental Housing Protection Act to avoid demolition of rental accommodations. It was this government that brought in the regulations with respect to unnecessary repairs. It was this government that extended rental review protection to roomers, and the list could go on and on.

I would suggest to my colleague that the actions of this government much more clearly answer the question that she has asked.

The Speaker: Supplementary.

Hon Mr Bradley: There has to be a supplementary.

An hon member: What did Mike do now?

Ms Poole: The minister has made it clear that this government intends to continue our strong protections for tenants. In view of that, I have no supplementary.

AIR QUALITY LEGISLATION

Mrs Grier: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. My leader asked the Minister of the Environment about Countdown Acid Rain last week and I do not wish to hear from him about that. What I would like to hear from him is, what else is he going to do about air pollution and why, it being now two and a half years since he announced a revision of regulation 308 which controls air pollution across the province, has no action been taken to update a regulation which he said was outdated and badly in need of review?

1450

Hon Mr Bradley: All kinds of good things are happening, if the member would only observe carefully. For instance, we were the only jurisdiction in Canada last year to mandate that low-smog gas must be used in the vehicles in Ontario. That

resulted, for instance, in about a 10% reduction of the smog which normally would have been expected in this province. I am sure that other provinces will do the same thing.

The member will know, of course, that we banned apartment incinerators in this province, which were causing a great problem, particularly in the urban areas of this province. That has resulted in improvement. She will know that through the leadership of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, all of Canada will now be having the California standards for vehicle emissions for cars that are being operated in this country on the same schedule as California. She will know that our ministry officials visit a large number of industrial operations right across Ontario. There is an upgrading of all those. She will know that we require the best available technology for—

The Speaker: Thank you. If she knows that, there is no point in telling her.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

INSURANCE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1989 (continued)

Consideration of Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance.

The Acting Chair (Mr Polsinelli): We are considering Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance. As of yesterday's session, we stopped at subsection 1(5). I would remind all members that the vote on all the divisions and all the amendments will be taken today at 5:30, according to the agreement of this House during yesterday's session. It was a friendly agreement. The motion called for 5:45, and the House agreed that the vote would be taken at 5:30 today.

Section 1:

The Acting Chair: Are there any further comments on subsection 1(5)?

Mr Kormos: Mr Chairman, the minister is not here again today. The reason why—and you were here on Monday—I am concerned is because the poor member for Guelph did his very best, but disarmed as he was, and that is to say, without armaments, without information, without data, without documentation, he was beside himself as to how he was going to respond to some of the pithy questions put to him by my friend the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale and indeed the Tory critic and myself. If I may at the onset, in view of the fact that we are still at section 1 and there were a number of issues raised to which the poor member for Guelph had no response, among them was a whole lot of questioning about the budgeting for the commission, salaries to be paid—

The Acting Chair: Order. I would like to remind the members that we are dealing with subsection 1(5). As I read subsection 1(5), it deals with the definition of "superintendent." All the items up to that point have been debated, and I would request that members of the House confine their remarks to the section under discussion.

Mr Kormos: If I may, Mr Chairman, you are almost correct, but in fact we had closed off the last day by referring back to subsection 1(3) and various definitions, and consideration of things like commission surcharges, fees, etc.

The Acting Chair: Order. I was in the chair when I asked all the members of the House whether all the items up to subsection 1(5) had been discussed. No one in the House had any further comments up to subsection 5. We are dealing with subsection 1(5). I would remind members of the House, and I would ask them, please, to confine their remarks to the section under discussion.

Mr Kormos: With all due respect, I would remind the Chair that when he assumes the chair he should stop being partisan. But of course the Chair knows that.

The Acting Chair: Order.

Mr Kormos: I know that this is an embarrassing exercise.

The Acting Chair: Order. It is the Chair's responsibility to maintain the debate and the decorum that is appropriate to this House. The Chair is simply reminding the members of the item under discussion, and it is the responsibility of the members to discuss the item under discussion. The member for Welland-Thorold, subsection 1(5).

Mr Kormos: Thank you, Mr Chairman. And I cannot tell you how much the member for Guelph thanks you. He is as relieved as he ever could be about the Chair not permitting any more discussion about rates, commissions, surcharges, rebates and dividends.

Let's talk about the superintendent of insurance. Let's talk about the amount of moneys by which the superintendent of insurance's budget will be reduced by virtue of the creation of the Ontario Insurance Commission. That is the first question to this parliamentary assistant.

Mr Ferraro: Thank you, Mr Chairman, for your unbiased observance of the rules.

I do have more explicit and detailed documentation vis-à-vis the fiscal operation of the entire proposed insurance commission. Dealing specifically with the request of the member for Welland-Thorold, there essentially is no reduction in the department of the superintendent of insurance, in that there is an amalgam, as the House knows, of the department of the superintendent of insurance and the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board. In that regard, there in fact are additional expenditures.

Mr Kormos: What will the role of the superintendent of insurance be once the establishment of an automobile insurance commission is effected by virtue of this bill being rammed through the Legislature?

Mr Ferraro: The role of the superintendent of insurance essentially is an administrative role as opposed to the role of the insurance commissioner, which essentially is the role of a chief executive officer. I can be more explicit if indeed he requires it.

Mr Kormos: I appreciate that.

Mr Ferraro: I will. I apologize because my staff is not here to nurse me along as yet. It is a matter of getting my paperwork in order. Mr Chairman, I am wondering if we could set that particular question down while I search and have the member ask another question. I will answer it shortly.

The Acting Chair: That question has been stood down. Any further remarks on subsection 1(5)?

Mr Kormos: The superintendent of insurance is a particularly ineffective institution now. Is there anything in this legislation that provides teeth for what is an impotent, powerless apologist for this government's cosy relationship with the auto insurance industry?

1500

Mr Ferraro: I disagree with the member for Welland-Thorold's vision of what this commission will be doing vis-à-vis its relationship with insurance companies. I do say without question that indeed the insurance commission will have substantially more teeth than the present department of the superintendent of insurance as it exists in the ministry now. I have found the specific definition, if you will, and delineation of the superintendent's office. With the indulgence of the Chair, I will subsequently read to the House, if acceptable, what the duties are.

As indicated, the superintendent is the chief administrative officer of the commission and has responsibility for such administrative matters as are assigned by the commissioner, the CEO. The superintendent was traditionally responsible for the day-to-day regulation of the insurance industry and, except for such duties that have been passed on to the commissioner by the bill, the superintendent retains these responsibilities.

The superintendent's powers and duties include: determining the right of an insurer to be licensed; directing inquiries to insurers; examining books and other information of insurers, agents, adjusters or brokers; requiring that full information on contracts of insurance be forwarded by persons licensed under the act; examining an insurer's annual statement and making inquiries regarding an insurer's solvency in compliance with the act; investigating and examining the affairs of every person engaged in the business of insurance to see whether such person is engaged in an unfair or deceptive act or practice; making orders, including interim orders, that a person committing an unfair or deceptive act cease or refrain from doing such an act; monitoring reports from auditors and other professionals regarding breaches of the act, and making applications to the High Court for an order directing a person to comply with the act.

Mr Kormos: In view of the fact that the parliamentary assistant seems to be saying that the superintendent is going to maintain the responsibility that he appears to have had in the past for supervising the solvency of insurers, I wonder if the parliamentary assistant could indicate whether a scenario like Advocate General could recur if Bill 68 is passed.

Mr Ferraro: That would require some degree of speculation, but suffice it to say that it is the view of the government, and certainly of the ministry, that with these new powers, with the establishment of the insurance commission and with the substantive increase in the amount of provisions provided therein vis-à-vis its authority to investigate, to demand, if you would, information; and the requirement that insurance companies file on a regular basis; and the penalty provisions, which are substantive—so much so that they can result in the insurance company not being allowed to practise—and indeed, admittedly, with some increased funding in order to supervise the insurance companies, particularly in the adjustment period, we would like to think that such situations would not occur. Of course, I cannot stand here and say that it will not occur, but we would like think it will not occur.

Mr Kormos: Is the parliamentary assistant indicating that it was insufficient funding that led to the improper supervision by the superintendent of insurance of Advocate General?

Mr Ferraro: No, I am not. Bearing in mind the mandate and the regulatory authority that existed in the department of insurance and a number of factors inherent in the day-to-day business of insurance in this province, I am suggesting that

indeed we have had essentially no reflection on the ability of the government to carry on investigation of insurance companies, but admittedly, and I do not hesitate to indicate, that the office of the superintendent of insurance, as it exists now, will not be comparable, in my view, to the department of insurance that we are creating with this bill.

Mr Kormos: Just a minute. Advocate General went belly-up, leaving thousands of policyholders with no insurance protection and no refund of the premiums they had paid. Maybe the parliamentary assistant could tell us just how that happened, in view of the purported responsibility of the superintendent of insurance to supervise the solvency of insurers.

Mr Ferraro: Mr Chairman, you have no idea how relieved I am to see my staff here. Aside from the fact that they are providing moral support, they also provide me with many of these wonderful answers.

Advocate General, it should initially be pointed out, is a federally chartered insurance company. I should also point out that in these situations, as dreadful as they are vis-à-vis the consumers and drivers of Ontario, there is a compensation fund available to which application can be made. I am told by my excellent staff that it is to the aggregate amount of \$200,000.

But to suggest that we will never have another bankruptcy in the insurance or any other business in Ontario, I am sure the member opposite would agree, is something that no one would want to suggest.

Mr Kormos: I am not sure, but I think that what the parliamentary assistant is trying to say is that the superintendent of insurance did not supervise Advocate General because Advocate General, albeit licensed by Ontario, was not incorporated in Ontario. Is that correct on my part?

Mr Ferraro: I reiterate that the office of the superintendent of insurance and indeed the regulatory parameters developing and allowing that office to function are not nearly as all-encompassing and strong as those proposed for the insurance commissioner's department in Bill 68. It is our firm belief that under the new regulatory regime, under the new guidance of the insurance commissioner, things such as those that transpired in the past will certainly be diminished, if not, hopefully, cease to exist in the near future.

Mr Kormos: In view of the fact that there are more than a handful, indeed a score, of auto insurers licensed by Ontario selling insurance in Ontario, purportedly providing coverage to people in Ontario, and in view of the fact that this government has refused to supervise any of those numerous companies because they are either federally incorporated or incorporated in the laws of another province—that is to say, not Ontario—notwithstanding that they are licensed to sell insurance in Ontario, are we being told that the new superintendent of insurance, the new improved superintendent of insurance, the one who belongs up on the grocery store shelves besides the new improved Tide, really is nothing more than just a whole bunch of new packaging, new colours, new style, or is in fact this new superintendent of insurance really going to supervise all licensees here in Ontario?

Mr Ferraro: I guess it requires, to some degree, a general comment. As the member would know, there are 400 insurance companies operating in Ontario. Approximately 145 of those companies provide auto insurance. Again, I acknowledge that it is regrettable that situations such as the demise of Advocate General happen. Somebody once said to me: "If you want security, rob a bank. You'll get 10 years." I am not sure that

even exists, but these are realities of doing business. You allow licensing. You allow insurance companies that, by and large, do an admirable job in providing a service, bearing in mind economic conditions and corporate ideology and so forth. But these things happen.

We are confident, however, having said that, that the new environment in which insurance companies are compelled to operate, bearing in mind the concern that this government, and indeed the whole House, has for the consumers in acquiring insurance, will be much more stringent and much more conducive to providing the 6.2 million people who drive and need auto insurance in this province with a comfort level that they are not being ripped off or mistreated.

Mr Kormos: Is the new superintendent of insurance going to supervise all of those insurance companies licensed to sell insurance in Ontario with a view to determining their solvency?

Mr Ferraro: Yes.

1510

Mr Kormos: Does that include insurers who are incorporated not under the laws of the province of Ontario but under the laws of another province or under the laws of the federal government?

Mr Ferraro: As the member knows, any insurance company that is licensed to sell insurance in Ontario must meet our standards irrespective of where they are incorporated. The short answer is yes.

Mr Kormos: Does that mean that the provincial government is no longer going to rely on the supervisory role of the federal government as it did in the case of Advocate General?

Mr Ferraro: Suffice to say that there is a significant degree of co-operation between the federal and provincial governments in dealing with industries—in this case the insurance industry—where indeed there are federal incorporations and provincial incorporations, and hopefully that degree of co-operation will be strengthened. As well, there are significant discussions, acknowledgements and agreements between provinces vis-à-vis essentially the same issue.

Having said all that wonderful stuff, there is no hesitancy on my part to indicate that the provincial government, under the new regime in the new insurance commission, will be taking a much more proactive approach in supervision.

Mr Kormos: The parliamentary assistant talks about a compensation fund available to persons burned, and he talks about robbing a bank. This Liberal government may not have robbed banks lately, but it is sure putting a gun to the heads of drivers and taxpayers and innocent injured victims here in the province of Ontario. What it is doing to the taxpayers of Ontario makes robbing a bank seem like a misdemeanour.

The parliamentary assistant is talking about a compensation fund. Does he mean to say that those people who were ripped off for their premiums, who subsequently, midway through a policy, had to go out and buy new insurance because his superintendent of insurance was not supervising an auto insurer, Advocate General? Does that mean that those people who got ripped off for their premiums are going to be able to go to that compensation fund?

The Acting Chair: The member for Guelph, if he chooses to answer that.

Mr Ferraro: I do, thank you. The compensation fund covers claims, not premiums. I should point out that the super-

intendent of insurance office has existed for well over 100 years in different regulatory or statutory environments. But indeed, in defence of Ontario—notwithstanding the fact that there was this agreement between the federal and provincial governments vis-à-vis co-operation and so forth dealing with insurance companies—Ontario has, and I think rightly so, for example prohibited insurance companies that are insolvent or are not acting in the best interests of our consumers, in advance of the federal government, knowing full well that they were originally chartered by the federal government. So we have been proactive to a greater degree, in our view, than the federal government.

The Acting Chair: The Chair finds it incumbent upon itself to remind members what we are discussing. We are discussing subsection 1(5). It being such a short section, I thought perhaps I would read it to remind members who do not have it in front of them:

“(5) Paragraph 62 of section 1 of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

“62 ‘Superintendent’ means the superintendent of insurance appointed under section 4.”

That is what we are discussing. Does the member for Welland-Thorold have any further comments with respect to that particular subsection?

Mr Kormos: Please. Of course we are talking about superintendent of insurance. Come on, Mr Chairman. We are told later on that the Ontario Insurance Commission consists of “the commissioner, the superintendent and the director.” Perhaps the parliamentary assistant would distinguish for us the role of the commissioner as compared to the role of the superintendent and why one is one and the other is the other.

Mr Ferraro: I thought I had explained it, but perhaps not as well as my friend the member for Welland-Thorold wants. I delineated the role of the superintendent. If the member would like, I can also delineate essentially the role of the commissioner. But basically the commissioner, Mr Scott, is comparable to the chief executive officer. His duties, for example, would compel him to have more direct interaction, if you will, with government, with the ministry vis-à-vis the preparation of reports and so forth, and essentially he is the boss from the standpoint of that particular commission.

The superintendent is the administrative manager, if you will, of that operation, comprising, as the member knows, approximately 209 or 210 employees. So in that regard he is the chief administrator.

Mr Kormos: A Chair is a Chair is a Chair.

Mr Villeneuve: Not necessarily.

Mr Kormos: Not necessarily? That is right. Some Chairs are more knowledgeable than other Chairs. Some Chairs have a better recollection of the transcript of the previous day's proceedings. Some Chairs will recall the quasi undertakings made by a parliamentary assistant who could not answer questions, who could not answer diddly-squat with respect to a whole chunk of them and who as much as said, “Please give me time,” and now he has time and we are not going to hear anything any better.

We have heard some distinction made between the commissioner and the superintendent, because we are talking about “superintendent,” let's never forget that. If I may, why is it necessary to distinguish between “director” and “superintendent” in view of what we have already been told is the distinction between “commissioner” and “superintendent?”

Mr Ferraro: I do not want to give the member any more diddly in which to squat about. Perhaps it would be helpful if I read the actual duties of the commissioner, which would delineate and perhaps resolve some of the confusion in my friend's mind.

The commissioner, as I said, is the chief executive officer of the commission and is required to carry out the duties and exercise the powers of the commissioner under the Insurance Act. Specific powers and duties include:

"Establishing and maintaining a roster of persons available to be arbitrators; assigning appropriate administrative responsibilities to the superintendent; appointing mediators to act under the dispute resolution mechanism created in the act; appointing a medical and rehabilitation advisory panel and designating a Chair for the panel;

"Filing an annual report with the minister on the affairs of the commission and reporting to the minister as required; making rules governing procedures for proceedings to be decided before the commissioner, including fixing cars; hearing appeals from decisions of the superintendent; examining and reporting on questions related to insurance that the Lieutenant Governor in Council believes require a public hearing;

"Summoning and enforcing the attendance of witnesses in the same manner as the Supreme Court in the trial of civil action"—this power is also conferred on the superintendent, the director and arbitrators pre-assigned under the Insurance Act, I might point out—"requiring insurers to prepare and file a return respecting the insurer's business; approving the form of policy, endorsement or renewal in respect of automobile insurance; regulating underwriting practices of insurers in respect of auto insurance."

Two more, Mr Chairman: "Generally controlling the approval of classes and rates in respect of automobile insurance as set out in the bill; and designating a person who can require an insurer to produce books and records and who may examine an insurer at an office situate outside of Ontario."

Mr Kormos: I am wondering, for the benefit of the people who want to participate in this dialogue, whether there could be copies of that distributed?

Mr Ferraro: There can be copies of that distributed, certainly. I wish to apologize. My copy said that one of the jobs—it is a rather mundane job, really, I am sorry—of the insurance commissioner, who is paid \$100,000, was to make rules governing procedures for proceedings to be decided before the commissioner "including fixing cars"—it should have said "including fixing costs."

1520

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair (Mr Cureatz): Does that make a difference so we can complete the section?

Mr Kormos: Wait a minute. Mr Chairman, you bring up completing the section. We would like to complete discussion on the bill, but the fact is that the Liberals had no intention of ever permitting complete discussion of this legislation; no intention whatsoever. Then, with their brown shirts and their jackboots, they took the standing orders, chucked them out window and they used closure. The Liberals used closure and their arrogant majority to deny the members of this Legislature opportunity to discuss this even in the most modest of ways.

The member sat here for a whole afternoon, some two and three-quarter hours—big deal—when you heard valuable input

from members of the opposition about portions of this legislation which are going to be and should be of great concern to people all over Ontario. So when you talk about finishing this, Mr Chairman, oh yes, we would like to finish it, but we would like to see it finished as a result of a complete and thorough discussion, not as a result of the Liberals having their way once again. Basically, you are steam-rolling the whole show.

The Second Deputy Chair: I have to interrupt. Does this mean no?

Mr Kormos: We are not finished with this section yet.

The Second Deputy Chair: I just wanted to be sure.

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: I am waiting for a copy of what the parliamentary assistant just read. By the way, I do accept the parliamentary assistant's apologies. The member for Guelph has a whole lot to apologize about, not just to me but to the people of Ontario, for advocating such horribly bad legislation.

What I am interested in is, is it the superintendent of insurance who is going to be involved in rate-setting?

Mr Ferraro: Again, I apologize to the House. I did not hear the question.

Mr Kormos: Is the superintendent of insurance going to be responsible for rate-setting? I suppose the parliamentary assistant does not want to answer that.

Mr R. F. Johnston: I was wondering if we might take a short recess until we get a copy of this definition.

The Second Deputy Chair: No, we are not allowed to do that. Nice try.

Mr Kormos: Would the parliamentary assistant please answer my question?

The Second Deputy Chair: Actually, I am embarrassed to say I missed the question myself.

Mr Kormos: Is the superintendent of insurance responsible for rate-setting?

The Second Deputy Chair: Is the superintendent of insurance responsible for rate-setting?

Mr Ferraro: I am surprised, after listening to my friend for 17 hours when he exuded a tremendous amount of stamina, that his vocal cords just now are starting to fail him.

The superintendent is part of the insurance commission and the insurance commission—I am sorry—the commissioner is responsible for the rate-setting, not the superintendent.

Mr Kormos: Why did the parliamentary assistant tell us that the commission was responsible for rate-setting when in fact it is only one member: the commissioner? Why does he tell us things like that and then have to take them back mere moments later? Can he answer that?

Mr Ferraro: The only guy I know who was perfect got nailed to a cross. I am sorry if I led the member opposite astray. Suffice to say that the commission, to some degree, will have input to the commissioner as to whether rates are acceptable or not. As such, indirectly, the commission is responsible, but the commissioner, according to the legislation, is personally responsible for rates.

Mr Runciman: At this juncture, I want to make an appeal, I guess, in respect to some of the amendments that have been

tabled by the opposition. I think it is important, especially when we start to deal with the threshold.

I know that in clause-by-clause in committee the government restricted the opportunities of the opposition to deal in a meaningful way with virtually the bulk of the bill, if you will, Mr Chairman. We are going to have a cutoff of debate at 6 o'clock. It is our last opportunity in committee of the whole, given the restrictions placed upon us by the Liberal government. I think it is important that we have an opportunity to deal with sections 47 and 57, where there are a significant number of amendments. I would like to see the support of the government that we move to section 47 so we can start dealing with these very important amendments.

The Second Deputy Chair: Far be it from me to—

Mr Kormos: Mr Chairman, if I might.

The Second Deputy Chair: All right, sure.

Mr Kormos: On Monday, the very first of the mere two half-days that the Liberals are going to permit us to talk about this, I stood up and proposed that this government permit us to accelerate through these various sections to get up to the threshold part of it, because that is the single most important part. What was the Liberal response, their typical, supercilious, snotty kind of response? It was, "Yes, only if you waive discussion on any of the intermediary sections." We do not waive discussion on them.

I tell you once again, just as we told you on Monday and just as we tell these Liberals sitting here pretending to speak for their constituents—they are speaking for the insurance industry real good—we are quite prepared, as a matter of fact we are eager, to see these sections discussed out of order so we can get down to threshold right now, because, boy, do I have some questions to ask the parliamentary assistant about threshold. He had better brush up on his threshold, I tell him that right now.

Mr Ferraro: Having been privileged with the carriage of this bill for a number of months and listening to my friends opposite, I can assure them that my threshold is as strong as anybody's threshold. With that having been said, the government has no problem in proceeding. I look to you, however, Mr Chairman. Our only concern is an administrative one. We would have to then deem that all the sections leading up to that had passed, including our amendments.

Mr R. F. Johnston: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, on that matter.

The Second Deputy Chair: I had not had a chance to—

Mr R. F. Johnston: I know. I just wanted to remind you—

The Second Deputy Chair: To help me.

Mr R. F. Johnston: As a past chairman of committees myself—just to make it understandable to the member for Guelph, who has not been here for as many tedious years as I have been and gone through this so many times—I just wanted to say that many times in committee we move ahead, leaving certain sections unpassed and unresolved, to deal with another matter and then to come back and start again. So it is not required for us to pass certain sections before we go ahead, especially when we are doing a stacking process and where all the motions will be deemed to be placed at the end of this process.

Therefore, if there is a substantive matter like the threshold question which the member for Leeds-Grenville wishes to raise,

we could easily deal with that and still go back to other matters following. I am sure that is what the Chair would have told you.

Mr Ferraro: I appreciate my much more experienced friend indicating that to the House and to me. The point I was trying to make, being cognizant of that fact, was that the procedure, I guess, would be that we would have to essentially assume that those paragraphs, the clauses beforehand, have been deemed to have been moved and read. This is what my staff is telling me we have to do.

The Second Deputy Chair: I do not know. That is news to me. We have often just jumped from area to area. I do want to remind all people that, of course, 5:30 is the bewitching hour, because at that time we are going to be putting forward all sections and all amendments, both opposition and government. So if it is the will of the committee to then jump forward to section 47 without passage of previous sections, because we will be doing that at 5:30 anyway, that is just fine with me.

Mr Kormos: Mr Chairman, do you mean that even if sections have not been discussed they are going to be deemed to have been discussed and deemed to have been passed without ever really doing it? Is that what is going to happen?

The Second Deputy Chair: That is the long and short of it. That is correct. That is the short of it, not the long of it.

Mr Kormos: The people of Ontario got the short end of the stick, I tell you that.

Mr Ferraro: Perhaps my friend the member for Scarborough West, his colleague, could indicate to the member opposite the procedures.

1530

The Second Deputy Chair: The member for Welland-Thorold, would you like to talk about section 47, since we have unanimous agreement about moving forward to section 47?

Mr Kormos: Of course, Mr Chairman. It was my suggestion.

The Second Deputy Chair: Standing down all other previous sections and amendments, the member for Leeds-Grenville.

Mr Runciman: I take it we are on section 47, are we?

Mr Kerrio: Wherever you want to go.

Section 47:

Mr Runciman: Okay. That is what I am going to talk to, in any event. This should not take too long and I am sure the member for Welland-Thorold will want to talk briefly about it.

We have introduced two amendments which are essentially trying to deal with the notion of cherry-picking. The government will suggest to you, Mr Chair, that perhaps the legislation adequately covers that area. Certainly, what we are hearing, especially from insurance brokers across the province who have to deal with this legislation on a day-by-day basis, is that they are not happy with it and they feel that this legislation, if it passes as it is currently structured and worded, is going to put the insurance companies in the position of being able to shove aside individuals in this province who perhaps are less fortunate and do not have salary continuation plans, for example.

What is going to happen? We are going to have the insurance industry looking at Mr X who comes in and applies for auto insurance. They look at his background and the application that he makes. He does not have a salary continuation plan; he

does not have those kinds of benefits. Indeed, he or she may be unemployed. He or she may be having all sorts of problems in society. What is going to happen to that individual who has had access to auto insurance in the past? He is going to be told now he presents a higher risk to the insurance industry—a higher risk because he does not have those collateral benefits that are going to kick in before this no-fault insurance takes over.

So what happens to that individual? He is refused access to auto insurance through the normal course of application through a broker and the insurance industry says: "You go to Facility. You go to the high-priced Facility Association. That is the only option for you, mister. That is the only option for you." What does that mean to that driver? That means an increase perhaps in the neighbourhood of 200% to 300%. That is what is going to happen and we are going to see many, many people in society faced with that sort of a dilemma.

The prediction has been made—it has been made to this government time and time again—that we are going to see significant increases in Facility and people are going to be hurt: people who do not belong in Facility, people who do not, in the truest sense, present any kind of a high risk on the highways and streets of this province, but only present a risk to the insurance industry on the basis that their tail is not going to be covered because these people, for a variety of reasons, do not have collateral benefits available to them: because of their place of work, because they are unemployed, or for a host of other reasons. So what they do is present a higher risk in respect to the payouts the insurance industry might have to make, if indeed that individual is in the unfortunate position of being injured in an automobile accident.

When you take a look at the risk classification process and system, we are talking about people in categories, essentially, who have bad driving records, who fall historically into groupings that present higher risks. Perhaps most of us can live with that; some cannot. But in any event, most of us can live with that kind of a classification system.

We cannot live with the idea of people who are being shoved into Facility being looked upon as higher risk simply because they are not among the most fortunate and better off in society. That is a reality of this legislation. That is what is going to happen. It is going to kick the people who can least deal with it in society.

We want to see this Liberal government address this very real concern. To say it is not a concern, that we have handled it adequately in this legislation, is not the reality. We have the insurance brokers of Ontario appealing to us. They are the people who have to deal with this. They have looked at the legislation and they say: "We are not happy with this. We are not happy. We work with these insurance companies on a day-by-day basis. We know what they are like. We know what they are going to do to the little guy. They are going to shove him into Facility—200% or 300% rate increase." The brokers are saying this. It is a concern of theirs.

So, obviously, it should be a very real concern to this Liberal government, if it has any concerns about that kind of person, that kind of individual, in Ontario's society today.

I would like to hear the parliamentary assistant's reaction to that. I do not want to hear him say this is adequately covered, because that is totally an inadequate response to a very legitimate concern.

Mr Ferraro: I say to my friend the member for Leeds-Grenville, I am not sure he wants to hear anything from the government, though I would be willing to accept anything. Suffice it to say, and I say respectfully—and I am sure the member

acknowledges this—that the amendment as put forth by the member opposite essentially saying, "We won't allow cherry-picking," in itself is not conducive to passage, if you will, in that "cherry-picking" may have an agricultural reference.

But I say with respect to the member opposite, I understand what he is saying, and the government and indeed everyone in the House has a concern about those insurance companies that are mistreating, for lack of a better word perhaps, many people in the province.

We are concerned, as he is, about the increase in the Facility Association. There is no question in my mind that some people in the Facility Association should not be there.

I suggest, with respect, that part and parcel of the fact that there are people in Facility, in the context of the insurance business, is the rate situation, among other things, the regulatory situation that presently exists in Ontario.

With the passage of Bill 68, there should be and will be an onset of a new not only regulatory framework, but a business framework in Ontario. Indeed, many companies, as everyone in the House knows, are not taking on new subscribers, are pulling in their horns vis-à-vis underwriting auto insurance in the insurance business in Ontario.

The new flexibility and the new rules under which Bill 68 will allow insurance companies to function—and it will subsequently permit new protective measures and reasonable rates for the consumers—should allow a loosening of the way they do business and how much business they do. As a result, some people who could not get insurance in the past no doubt will get insurance, in our view.

I also wish to say that of the people in the Facility Association now, there are many who are quite simply—and I think the member opposite would acknowledge this—bad risks, bad drivers. Some of them have convictions for drunk driving. Some of them have poor driving records and, as such, quite frankly, they should pay substantively higher amounts for their premiums. The difficulty is to dissect those from those who should not be there, the bad ones from those who are not in the same category.

In conclusion, I will say that in our view, Bill 68 does address specifically some of the concerns expressed, and they are legitimate concerns, I do acknowledge that to the member opposite. There are a number of amendments and motions that the member has copies of that will specifically deal with cherry-picking and our desire to eliminate it as best we can and if the member so desires, I would be happy to read them into the record.

Mr Kormos: First, let me make something perfectly clear. We of course support this amendment and without hesitation, and we completely reject the pathetic response of the parliamentary assistant.

He knows what we are talking about. Call it cherry-picking; that perhaps reflects the agricultural background of the member for Leeds-Grenville. When I worked in the mines, we used to call it high-grading. Call it whatever you wish, the fact is that insurance companies have for a long time, and now more than ever, been picking and choosing their insureds.

This parliamentary assistant knows that Mr Justice Osborne predicts, and rightly so, that as a result of Bill 68 there is going to be even more cherry-picking. Is that not right, I ask the parliamentary assistant? He knows that Mr Justice Osborne has predicted that, as a result of Bill 68, even more good drivers are going to be forced into Facility Association.

That is where the figure of almost one third of a million Ontario drivers comes from, that one third of a million who are

going to face premium increases—the parliamentary assistant should listen—of up to 80 per cent. These are the good drivers who are going to be forced into Facility Association as a result of the government's legislation, its Bill 68.

Not only does Mr Justice Osborne of the Supreme Court of Ontario say that, but Don McKay, the general manager of Facility Association, says that. The parliamentary assistant knows he said that in his third quarterly report of 1989. Don McKay, the general manager of Facility Association, the guy who runs it, said that as a result of Bill 68, insurers are going to be using avoidance techniques on certain classes of insureds.

1540

I hope the parliamentary assistant can sleep with this: senior citizens are going to be among those classes of people who are going to be forced not just into \$1,000 or \$2,000 but megabucks—thousands and thousands of dollars a year in premium increases. Seniors are the very sort of people that Mr Justice Osborne, yes and Don McKay, the general manager of Facility Association; seniors are the very sort of people that those two people are talking about as among those classes of people who are going to be forced into Facility because they are going to be arbitrarily denied insurance coverage. So you see, it is under this regime of Bill 68 that the Liberals are trying to impose on us that an amendment to prohibit cherry-picking becomes all that much more important and valid.

One of the basic errors that this government, the Liberals, has attempted to portray as accuracies is the actuarial presumptions that rest on there being an assumption that any given insurer has a proportionate number of various types of drivers, various classes of risks. The fact is that the profitability of insurance is probably going to be compounded, that is to say increased beyond what we have even speculated, we in the opposition talk about new profits of \$1 billion in the first year alone by virtue of the insurance companies using avoidance techniques. Why? Because this government has not got the slightest interest in passing legislation that could even come close to being considered consumer protection legislation. This government, the Liberals here at Queen's Park, has not got the slightest interest in offending its wealthy powerful buddies, its cosy paramours in the insurance industry.

The Second Deputy Chair: You know, I think I have been more than patient in letting him air some feelings and concerns about section 47, but there does come a point in time where a question should be asked so we could have some discussion.

Mr Kormos: We are talking about an amendment, Mr Chairman.

The Second Deputy Chair: All right then, ask something about the amendment.

Mr Kormos: I am indicating that it is important if we are going to talk about this in an intelligent way that I lay out the perspective that we in the New Democratic Party have on this issue in conjunction with the Conservative Party.

The Second Deputy Chair: I know and I do not want to get into a debate with the member but, of course, that was for second reading, which you and I both know has now been over with, much to my or your thoughts otherwise.

Mr Charlton: There was not any second reading on this amendment. This is the second reading debate on the amendment.

The Second Deputy Chair: Well, if the honourable member would like to participate in the discussion he can allow his colleague to sit down and he could stand up.

Mr Charlton: On a point of order, Mr Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: Well, fine. Stand up.

Mr Charlton: You are inappropriately harassing the member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Kormos: That is true.

Mr Charlton: There has been an amendment moved by the member for Leeds-Grenville and the member for Welland-Thorold has the perfect opportunity here to stand up and speak in support of it. He does not have to stand up and question it. There is an amendment on the floor for debate and that is the purpose of moving the amendment in the first place and the member for Welland-Thorold has every right to stand up and debate that amendment.

The Second Deputy Chair: Well, I have nothing but the highest respect and esteem for the honourable member for Hamilton Mountain, but I only would like to point out to him that it is the Chair's responsibility not to encourage debate as if this was second reading, but to encourage the questioning and facilitating of answering those questions from the parliamentary assistant. I have indicated to the member for Welland-Thorold that, in my humble evaluation, his full support and discussions had gone on at some length of time and I think it would be worth while for him now to pose a question or two to the parliamentary assistant.

Mr Kormos: If I must.

Mr Charlton: The Chair should look very carefully at the rules before he proceeds in that fashion.

Mr Kormos: When the Chair speaks of the high regard and respect he has for the member for Hamilton Mountain I would hope he has the same respect and regard for the basic rules.

Mr Charlton: The Chair has no right to limit debate on any amendment.

The Second Deputy Chair: I just want to say to the member for Hamilton Mountain, you are lucky the member for Oshawa is not here, because I can assure you his rulings would be totally different.

Mr Runciman: I wanted to pose a specific question. Looking at Bill 68, clause 208c(4)(d), the second amendment we have moved is in respect to cherry-picking. After the words "contrary to public policy" we have added, "such as the practice of cherry-picking."

The parliamentary assistant apparently objects to the use of that term. If that is his only discontent with this amendment we are certainly prepared to see some sort of change take place there if that is possible. He talks about the amendments the government is introducing and I have gone through them quickly. We are talking about what is required by the regulations. We do not know exactly what the regulations are going to say in respect to this. I guess I would feel much more comfortable as a member of this House—and the concerns are very real out there about cherry-picking—that it be quite specifically prohibited in this legislation.

We are talking about being contrary to public policy. Surely that sort of act on the part of an insurance company to selectively decline the less fortunate in society from having access to reasonably priced automobile insurance is contrary to public

policy. I would think so and I would like to hear the parliamentary assistant's views as to why he feels we should not be that specific in respect to this legislation in terms of applying a prohibition to that distasteful conduct on the part of certain insurers.

The Second Deputy Chair: Before the honourable member responds, I would like to say to the member for Leeds-Grenville, are you discussing section 47 of the bill, clause 208c(4)(d) of the act? You are? I do not believe you actually moved the proposed amendment.

Mr Runciman moves that clause 208c(4)(d) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 47 of the bill, be amended by inserting after the word "policy" the following:

"such as the practice of cherry-picking, whereby insurers are highly selective with offers of insurance coverage in the voluntary market, thus forcing consumers to seek very expensive coverage through the province's insurer of last resort, the Facility Association."

Mr Ferraro: The government cannot accept the member's amendment for the specific reason that we think the present amendments and indeed the regulations being proposed by the government should satisfy many, if not all, of the concerns of the member opposite.

Suffice it to say, if the member so requires, I will be happy to read some of the regulations that would offset perhaps some of his concerns. But to be more specific than that would perhaps be a waste of time. I know the member for Welland-Thorold would not want to waste the House's time.

Mr Kormos: You know, Mr Chairman, what a stupid thing to say in response to this amendment. This parliamentary assistant knows that people across Ontario have been getting Dear John or Dear Jean letters from their insurance companies, not just for months now, but for years.

There is absolutely nothing about Bill 68 that is going to correct that problem. I wonder if the parliamentary assistant would comment on the observations made by Mr Justice Osborne of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

Mr Ferraro: Mr Chairman, it is appropriate that we are dealing with the topic of cherry-picking because it appears that the members of the opposition, specifically the member for Welland-Thorold, cherry-picks quotes from Mr Justice Osborne and negates others. For example, his party is a proponent of public government auto insurance. Mr Justice Osborne specifically and at length indicated that the auto insurance business in Ontario should remain in private hands. However, the member opposite never alludes to that fact.

1550

I think it is appropriate that some of the innuendo perhaps be dispelled. It is my view, quite frankly, that the vast majority of the people of Ontario will not fully understand the bill until it is passed and indeed until they deal with their insurance company or get some information, if you will, from the ministry or, God forbid, get into an accident. However, I should point out to the Chair and to the people that the commissioner has specific powers to deal with companies who will abuse and indeed will cherry-pick.

For example, it is in section 47 of the bill that: "The commissioner may order, at any time, a hearing with respect to any ground set out in the list filed with the commission if the commissioner is of the opinion that the ground or the manner in which it is applied, (a) is subjective; (b) is arbitrary; (c) bears

little or no relationship to the risk to be borne by the insurer in respect of an insured; or (d) is contrary to public policy."

Indeed, there are regulations in section 47, for example, limitation on termination, to be specific: "(1) If so required by the regulations and unless the insurer has complied therewith, an insurer shall not decline to issue or terminate or refuse to renew a contract in respect of such coverages and endorsements as may be set out in the regulations or decline to issue, terminate or refuse to renew any contract or refuse to provide or continue any coverage or endorsement on any ground set out in the regulations."

There are a number of regulations—and I will be happy to send a copy over to the members opposite—that specifically give, in essence, the commissioner the power to deal with arbitrary usage, if you will, of their prerogative as underwriters to restrict insurance on the part of the people.

There is another one, for example: "(5) Following a hearing with respect to a ground, the commissioner, (a) may prohibit an insurer from declining to issue, terminating or refusing to renew any contract or from refusing to provide or continue any coverage or endorsement on that ground; or (b) may prohibit an insurer from applying that ground, in the manner specified by the commissioner, to decline to issue, terminate or refuse to renew any contract or refuse to provide or continue any coverage or endorsement."

Specifically, what all that means is that there are specific regulations and statutory controls whereby the commissioner can deem it to be, in the most general form, an action on the part of an insurance company to cherry-pick, to be arbitrary, and as such can stop it.

Mr Kormos: Is the parliamentary assistant saying that the Honourable Mr Justice Osborne was wrong?

Mr Ferraro: What I am saying is that Bill 68, and the insurance commission being established thereby, to the best of our knowledge, will prohibit cherry-picking in the future.

Mr J. M. Johnson: It was brought to my attention on the weekend by a broker that in many instances the insurance companies will instruct the broker to terminate his insurance with an individual. His concern is the availability of the insurance. The parliamentary assistant is just discussing it now, but he feels that many good clients will be forced to accept Facility Association insurance because the companies will not write them or will tie it in to having their home insurance with the same company. How does the parliamentary assistant propose to prevent this happening?

Mr Ferraro: That has been a concern of just about every member in the House and has been the case to some degree in the past. Specifically, what my friend the member for Wellington is referring to is what they call tied selling. He is absolutely correct that it has been a sore spot, to say the least, and—in the government's view and I am sure in the view of everyone view in the House—an unfair action on the part of insurance companies. Specifically, tied selling, as delineated in the bill, is not allowed.

Mr J. M. Johnson: Does the government have any mechanism in place so that an individual will have recourse to appeal if he is caught in this situation?

Mr Ferraro: Essentially, there are two approaches. If the broker is being forced to tied sell, which of course will be prohibited under the bill, the broker has recourse to a system of arbitration that presently exists that may alleviate the situation vis-à-vis the brokers and the insurance companies specifically.

If the broker, who is also a taxpayer and an insured himself, assuming it is a male in this case, has a specific concern, he can also contact the insurance commissioner directly. In so doing, the insurance commissioner will investigate, and if indeed there is guilt, the insurance company will be dealt with accordingly.

Mr Runciman: I do not want to see us spend any more time on this. We certainly wanted to put our views on the record and let the member for Welland-Thorold have his views expressed, and the government's, with respect to this particular concern. Prior to standing on my feet this afternoon, I appreciated that we were not going to get a positive response from the government and the parliamentary assistant. We have not received that kind of indication throughout this whole lengthy process.

The parliamentary assistant has suggested, and he has done so again here today, that the regulations, to some degree in any event, will remedy or alleviate the concerns out there with respect to the actions of the insurance industry in very selectively picking its clients and penalizing some of the less fortunate members of society with respect to their ability to obtain affordable automobile insurance in this province.

My response to that remains that we are not satisfied with doing this through regulation. As you know, Mr Chairman, and as all of us in this assembly know, the regulations are easily changeable through order in council. We feel this is an important enough issue that a ban on this sort of thing should be very clearly spelled out in the legislation.

The parliamentary assistant just jumped to his feet in response to my colleague's concerns about tied selling. He said the legislation very clearly bans tied selling. If that is a major concern, and he has indicated in the House that cherry-picking is also a very legitimate, valid, real concern out there, why is he so reluctant to incorporate that particular element in this legislation? He can handle one that way, but he cannot handle the other one that way. He says: "Trust me. Trust the Liberal government. We are going to deal with this problem effectively through regulation."

We have a great deal of difficulty with that. We would much prefer, and we think it is in the best interests of consumers in this province, if that sort of restriction were incorporated in the bill itself. But obviously, from the responses we have heard today from the parliamentary assistant, that just is not going to happen. That is indeed regrettable, as is this legislation for the most part regrettable, and certainly not in the best long-term interests of consumers in this province.

I do not want to spend any more time on this, because we have all had an opportunity to put our views on the record. Given the limited time the Liberal government is affording us in committee of the whole, we only have another hour and a half to try to deal with a number of other meaningful amendments, especially the impact of the threshold, which is the most onerous part of this legislation, and how it is going to impact on and restrict the availability of the courts dealing with the head-injured, psychological trauma, etc.

I know the member for Welland-Thorold has agreed to this, and if the parliamentary assistant is in agreement, I would suggest that we move on to section 57 and start discussing our concerns about the threshold as worded.

The Second Deputy Chair: The honourable member has suggested that we stand down section 47, as we have all the previous sections, for the vote at 5:30 and move on to section 57.

Mr Ferraro: Mr Chairman, I would agree with that if you would allow me just a short response to the member opposite in this regard.

The member is quite right. The bill specifically deals with tied selling and says it is not allowed. It would be prohibited. I think, in our view, in the government's view—and I acknowledge that there are differences in views—the cherry-picking aspect of it is a legitimate concern.

We believe strongly that in regulatory form and in the powers of the commissioner himself, much of the abuse that has transpired, as acknowledged by the member for Leeds-Grenville, in the context of those powers and in the context of the regulations, which are every bit as significant, if you will, as being directly in the bill per se, much of the cherry-picking, if not all of it, will be alleviated.

1600

There is no question that any time you have new legislation—and indeed this is a substantive change, as indicated on many occasions, in how the people of Ontario, the 6.2 million drivers, get their auto insurance—there will be an adjustment process. There is no question that there will be examples, that all members will receive constituent concerns about being put into Facility when they should not be there.

By putting it in regulatory form, it may, in our view, be beneficial from the standpoint of an adjustment being required to deal with that particular aspect of cherry-picking in a more definitive way, although we are quite satisfied that it has enough teeth in it now, that we have the flexibility to change those regulations quickly.

The members in the House know that if we were to put that specific issue in the bill per se, it would require a change to the bill. We all know how difficult it is to change or indeed, certainly in the case of Bill 68, to get a bill passed. So the flexibility of having it in regulatory form, just as the no-fault benefits are in regulation, allows the government and the insurance commissioner to adjust accordingly, bearing in mind the circumstances.

Section 57:

The Second Deputy Chair: Speaking then to section 57, is the honourable member for Wellington going to move the section? Does the parliamentary assistant have a copy of the proposed Conservative amendment? You do? I was going to suggest—it is quite lengthy, and possibly—does the honourable member move and dispense with the reading?

Mr J. M. Johnson moves that subsection 231a(1) of the Insurance Act, exclusive of the clauses, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"(1) In respect of non-economic loss or non-economic damage arising directly or indirectly from the use or operation, after this section comes into force, of an automobile and despite any other act, no owner of an automobile, no occupant of an automobile and no person present at the incident is liable in an action in Ontario for non-economic loss or non-economic damage from bodily injury arising from such use or operation in Canada, the United States of America or any other jurisdiction designated in the no-fault benefits schedule involving the automobile unless, as a result of such use or operation, the person has died or has sustained."

Mr Ferraro: The government cannot accept this particular amendment because essentially the no-fault principle is the heart and soul, if you will, of the direction of Bill 68. It is our view, quite frankly, having examined the insurance business in other jurisdictions, including outside of the country of Canada,

that this form of threshold no-fault is necessary in order to deal with the rising and anticipated costs of premiums, if indeed this bill does not pass, to the extent that on average it would be 30%.

Among all the other factors that the government looked at, this new approach to insurance in Ontario will provide a much more equitable and fair treatment of accident victims, whether they are guilty or not of having had the accident, quite frankly. Indeed it will allow people in Ontario to get quick and much-needed treatment for rehabilitation purposes and to get back in the position they were in before the accident occurred.

We are striving to come up with a balanced approach to dealing with the insurance crisis in Ontario. The threshold no-fault as evident in Bill 68 would provide the fairest and most comprehensive way for the 6.2 million who have to drive or wish to drive in Ontario to do so in an environment of reasonable rates with just and needed treatment on the part of insurance companies, and indeed in order to live in Ontario.

Mr J. M. Johnson: Why is it that there is no other jurisdiction in North America in which the system of threshold automobile insurance is in place with two of the thresholds tied together? Why will this be the first one?

Mr Ferraro: As I indicated, essentially the government has looked at different forms of insurance in different jurisdictions. We have looked at all the provinces and the schemes they have. We have looked at many states where they have threshold systems, in particular Michigan, New York and New Jersey. In so determining what is best for Ontario, we took some of the good things from some of these jurisdictions and applied them to the Ontario motorist protection plan, Bill 68. We have a made-in-Ontario plan.

The member is quite right. There are distinctions in the way different provinces deal with the insurance industry per se. The member will know, I am sure, that in Quebec, for example, no access to tort or a pure threshold system exists. Irrespective of whether it is a serious accident in Quebec or there is death or dismemberment, they have no access to the courts whatsoever. In other jurisdictions, of course, there is full access to the courts for whatever particular reason.

Ontario has taken a balanced approach and I am mindful of the fact, and everyone knows, that the government was inundated with opinions, for which we were very grateful. On the one hand, we had lawyers and people in the legal business suggesting that full access to the courts is needed. On the other hand, we had insurance companies that were saying, "No, we want to go to the Quebec system," whereby absolutely no access to the courts is allowed irrespective of severity of injury.

We think the approach of the government of Ontario is a balanced one in that regard. Aside from the many other things that we are doing to alleviate the pressure on insurance premiums, we have taken a balanced approach to dealing with the threshold aspect. We have said essentially that you are not going to be able to sue unless the injury is serious and permanent. This has upset a lot of people, and I understand that. But the tradeoff is, I point out to members in the House—and they know this—that if money was not an issue, I think it is acknowledged by just about everybody that if the government did nothing, everyone's premiums would go up on average at least 30%.

Speaking as the member for Guelph, people have said to me, "Rick, there is no way I can afford that premium," and I say the affordability problem is what precipitated, to a significant degree, Bill 68. One can argue whether or not the opposition

parties have addressed that particular aspect. I suggest that we have in Bill 68.

1610

But the point I want to conclude with, at least at this point, is this. While we have taken the balanced approach to allow access to court in the case of serious and permanent injury, there must be something for those people who either through their fault or no fault of their own can be dealt with in a fair and equitable way.

As I am sure members know, we have significantly enhanced the no-fault benefits schedule. By that I mean, to be very brief, the present no-fault schedule in Ontario essentially gives an income replacement of \$140. The new system will allow up to 80% of the individual's income to be replaced, to a maximum of \$600. The original amount was \$450. As a result of the public hearings and concerns expressed by people that this was not high enough, the government has reacted and increased it to \$600. That is equivalent to, I think it is, \$39,000 a year, which would cover approximately 85% of those who earned a salary or a living in the province. I think that is phenomenal. I think it is an increase of 326%.

Mrs Marland: What percentage?

Mr Ferraro: Some 85% of the people earning a living in Ontario will be covered by that \$600 threshold.

The other significant factor that was addressed for the first time is that retired people, unemployed and students will be eligible for income replacement. That did not occur before. Homemakers before were allowed \$70 a week and now will get \$185 a week.

Perhaps one of the most significant changes is the increase in the rehabilitative, long-term care aspect of the no-fault benefits. Before, if you needed a special prosthesis, counselling, a therapist, if you needed anything, you had a maximum of \$25,000 essentially. Under the new program—and again this is the tradeoff for the lack of the ability to sue for those less-than-serious injuries and permanent injuries—you will now get up to \$1 million in rehabilitative and long-term care, so just about every concern and need of those unfortunate people who are injured will be addressed and will be addressed quickly.

No longer will people, assuming they can prove their innocence, have to go to court, wait four or five years in many cases, and hope that they will be victorious in order to get the money they need to compensate themselves and indeed to rehabilitate themselves to get back into the mainstream of life in Ontario. Now, within 10 to 30 days, they will get the immediate money necessary. In the case of rehabilitation, they will have up to \$500,000, if they need all this equipment or whatever. They will be dealt with expeditiously.

Mr Runciman: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I want to express an objection. This perhaps is not a point of order that you will uphold, but I think that part of this process is we are attempting to get some answers in respect to this matter.

You have chastised members of the opposition in respect to posing questions, and what we are hearing here is this kind of diatribe on the part of the parliamentary assistant in trying to justify this terrible piece of legislation. I guess I would like to hear some specific responses to questions, following your advice, that we have attempted to pose to the parliamentary assistant.

Mr Ferraro: This is the first opportunity in weeks I have had to expel some of the frustration that I have experienced, having listened to the members opposite. I say that with great

respect. It is unfortunate that they do not want to listen to the facts. But let me conclude this way, because I do not want to unnecessarily antagonize members opposite and I am sure they want to ask me a lot of important questions, in which case they will not like the answers, but they want to ask them anyway.

Suffice it to say, and the bottom line is, that time will prove out, we think, that Bill 68 is acceptable to the people of Ontario. I said this once before. Having listened to members opposite week after week condemning this legislation, scaring seniors, scaring anybody who has to buy insurance in the province and who has to pay for that insurance with the bad news that they are promoting. If it is so bad, they should be happy that Bill 68 is going to pass, because that will upset all these people and the members opposite will be proven right. But I say to you, Mr Chairman, with great respect to the members opposite, that we are confident that the vast majority of people in Ontario will be happy with Bill 68, and that is the real reason they do not want this bill to pass.

Mr Philip: I have a series of questions based on the parliamentary assistant's statements. First, he says that he has done a comparison with each of the provinces, and then he says that if this bill had not passed, there would have been an increase of at least 30% in premiums. We are told by the minister that for my constituents it will be between 5% and 50% with this legislation, so I do not know where the benefit is. But I ask him if he has done a comparison of the premiums for equal insurance from one province to another. Can he project what the premiums will be in this province compared to a city of equal size with equal coverage, like Vancouver, in other jurisdictions, including Quebec, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and British Columbia? Can he give us those comparisons? Has he done those comparisons?

Mr Ferraro: As I indicated, we have studied insurance schemes, for lack of a better word, in other jurisdictions and, in our view, picked the best parts out of those jurisdictions where we thought it would be beneficial for the people of Ontario.

I want to clarify what the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale said. What the minister has said, what this government is saying, is that with the passage of Bill 68 there will be an average increase in the greater Metropolitan Toronto-Hamilton area of 8% and that in other areas, non-urban areas essentially, there will be 0% increase. We stand by that, and it goes without saying that some people who have expensive cars and who live in urban areas will be paying more for their insurance. It also goes without saying that everyone knows when you are dealing with averaging, a substantial number of drivers in Ontario will get reductions. That is a reality.

But one thing that is acknowledged by most rational people who are concerned about insurance in the province of Ontario is that if Bill 68 was not passed or, let me be quite candid, if we did nothing, there is a range from all actuarial studies of 29% to 44% increases for everyone. I am not talking about average; I am talking about for everyone. We have taken 30%. If the member opposite wants to dispute that, then that certainly is his right.

The only thing I can tell him specifically with regard to his question is, to compare a particular jurisdiction requires a significant degree of adjustment. The member would say, for example, we should take Vancouver and compare it to Toronto. Then you would subsequently have to adjust it and, depending on the actuary, I am sure you would have a distinction in conclusions. The member would know full well that even in Ontario, there is a significant distinction between rates, not only

between urban areas but in parts of Ontario, northern Ontario as opposed to southern Ontario and so forth.

The short answer is, I am not sure it would do a heck of a lot of good to take a particular city and then apply all these variables and adjustments to it. Suffice to say that, on average, when Bill 68 comes in, we think the province of Ontario will be quite competitive with other jurisdictions.

Mr Philip: Mr Chairman—

Mr J. M. Johnson: I thought it was in rotation.

The Second Deputy Chair: Well, that is true.

Mr Philip: I thought I am allowed at least a supplementary. That is the normal procedure. What the parliamentary assistant has said is that he has been afraid, and that is the history of this government. It has been afraid to do a comparison with those provinces that have owner-operated insurance. If the Liberals wanted to be truthful in this House, they know from their own constituents—any of them who have come from other jurisdictions such as British Columbia, Manitoba or Saskatchewan—that their insurance premiums skyrocketed when they came to Ontario and that they will skyrocket under this legislation.

What are the Liberals so afraid of that they cannot compare with other jurisdictions? The Globe and Mail can compare with other jurisdictions, but this ministry, with its whole bureaucracy and the extra bureaucracy it has built up at a tremendous cost to the taxpayer, cannot do a comparison. The only reason it does not want to do a comparison is that it has the answer that its ventriloquists, the insurance companies, do not like. That is why it does not want to do a comparison. The Globe and Mail does not have to worry about the insurance companies. It does not answer to the insurance companies, so it can do a comparison, and its comparison shows that it is cheaper in those three provinces.

I ask the parliamentary assistant why he cannot take cities of equal size, look at the accident rate in each of those cities and then compare rates. That seems like a simple thing to do. The only reason he cannot do it is that he is afraid to do it. He will not get the answers that the insurance companies like. That is why he does not want to do it.

1620

Mr Ferraro: I guess in part my response should be that the member is wrong, just wrong. First of all, the only city in Canada in which there can be a legitimate, if you will, comparison that would not require significant adjustment, so much so that it would make any findings totally irrelevant and illogical, would be Montreal. So if you are going to do a comparison between Toronto, as the member asked, and any other city in Canada, it would have to be Montreal, and only Montreal, to have any bearing.

The member would also know that Quebec—and the city of Montreal—has a pure no-fault system. The system that we are going to hopefully pass this week is a threshold no-fault system. Therefore, you cannot really compare the two.

I will finish with this, and I know they are just dying to hear this. The member is asking for more government study and more actuarial reports, and the member opposite, indeed members of the opposition, went on at great length during the public hearings to criticize the government because we spent \$250,000 on the 39 reports, to some degree, that we received.

The Second Deputy Chair: Is this a final supplementary?

Mr Philip: Did they do the proper studies in the beginning, not these phoney studies that they have done, not the studies that are going to prove what they want them to prove? Even using their own studies, the ones that they did not want to give to the public, that we had to force out of them, we have shown that the public does not want this bill, because when it gets in to examine their research, it knows just how terrible this legislation is.

Mr J. M. Johnson: Could the parliamentary assistant give me some answers pertaining to my riding, a rural riding, as he well knows. Farmers on permanent disability get \$600 a week for a maximum. Is that correct? Not a farmer—anyone.

Mr Ferraro: They will get 80% of their earnings, I say to the member opposite. I acknowledge that it is sometimes a little more difficult to deal with farm income, per se. If he wants me to be more explicit, I can refer to the bill's particular section whereby it is delineated how farm income will be determined.

Suffice to say, and I apologize for being somewhat lengthy, that in dealing with farm income, farmers and self-employed people in particular, it does pose a significant problem because of the infrequency, if you will, of a regular paycheque. So other considerations have to be made, and the ministry is endeavouring in the regulations to expand on the present regulatory framework therein in order to accommodate a greater degree of fairness.

Mr J. M. Johnson: The farmers in the past few years have been faced with very low commodity prices, high interest and many factors contributing to very low income. If this bill is designed in such a way that the income for the last few years is taken into consideration, it is going to be extremely difficult. I would hope that the government would give consideration to the cost to the farmer to have to replace his labour, his management skills on the farm, and not based just on income that he has had in the past few years, because through no fault of his own, he could have had very low income. It certainly would be unfair to only use that for the criteria. I hope the government will give consideration to a very broad interpretation of income replacement.

Mr Ferraro: I am sensitive to the real concerns being expressed by the member for Wellington. I know that he is certainly sincere about his concerns in dealing with those in the agricultural community, as we all share many of those concerns.

I would say to the member opposite that there is, at least—and I know this is not much to add on, quite frankly. There is a minimum amount now of \$235. There is also, and I guess he is going to have to trust me with this, a sincere attempt being made to look at the aspect, as I indicated, of how one justifies, from the standpoint of getting the no-fault benefit, the amount of income that a farmer, in this particular case, receives.

I should point out that, unlike situations under the present circumstances where self-employed people or farmers who do not have extra or optional insurance and indeed may be at fault through a momentary lapse or whatever, they would be in a much more precarious position than in this particular case. Although not high enough perhaps in the case of a farmer or a self-employed individual, the income will also be distributed within 10 days, which should alleviate to some degree the concerns as well as the necessary \$1 million in rehabilitation care that they may need in order to get back into a position where they can work again.

Mr Kormos: Let me make something clear. We in the New Democratic Party have always been advocates of a strong no-

fault component. Indeed, it was the insistence of New Democrats that created the no-fault system in this province well over 10 years ago. The government of the day did not see fit to index those no-fault benefits, especially the income replacement component of those no-faults, which are in every insurance policy covering every automobile in Ontario right now.

There is nothing new about no-fault insurance, and for the Liberals to dare suggest that somehow they have come across something new is not only bizarre but dishonest.

New Democrats in Ontario fought for no-fault components as a part of the standard auto insurance policy here in Ontario, just like New Democrats created strong no-fault components in British Columbia, in the driver-owned non-profit insurance system there; in Saskatchewan where driver-owned non-profit system has been in existence since 1946, when Tommy Douglas created the first driver-owned non-profit auto insurance system. Saskatchewan, just like British Columbia, just like Manitoba, has been able to consistently, over the years, provide auto insurance coverage for its residents at a rate cheaper, far less expensive than we have ever seen here Ontario.

Those jurisdictions have been the victims of rising costs, just like everywhere else. The premiums have gone up in British Columbia, in Saskatchewan and in Manitoba. But notwithstanding that they have increased from year to year to reflect increased cost, they are still the least expensive automobile insurance premiums in the whole country and in the history of any province, and certainly significantly cheaper, significantly less expensive than right here in Ontario. That is at the same time that provinces like British Columbia have provided no-fault components in their coverage far in excess of anything that Ontario has ever enjoyed.

1630

So we as New Democrats believe in no-fault coverage. All that means is that regardless of who caused the accident, an injured person is entitled to wage replacement and is entitled to speedy provision of medical and rehabilitative expenses. That is all no-faults are: that every injured person, be he at fault or not at fault, be entitled to that. It is as simple as that. That is what happens in British Columbia.

Indeed, if the Minister of Financial Institutions had bothered to come to those hearings, he would have heard from people involved in the system that here in Ontario there have always been troubles, expense and hurdles to overcome before victims can squeeze any no-faults out of their insurers. One witness who had done a whole lot of that type of work was asked, "Where is it any better?" The witness said, "In British Columbia," where no-fault benefits are provided speedily, without the hassle, without the red tape, without the litigation, without the legal expenses.

It is one of the characteristics of a public, driver-owned, non-profit system where there is accountability in a Legislative Assembly. You do not have to fight for your no-faults in British Columbia, in Manitoba or in Saskatchewan, because the drivers own those systems. Here in Ontario people have had to fight for their no-faults for as long as no-faults have been in existence—over a decade now—and they are going to have to fight even harder if the Liberals pass Bill 68.

But at the same time as we in the New Democratic Party believe strongly that there must be a no-fault component in any auto insurance system, we similarly believe that to arbitrarily deny innocent injured victims compensation for their pain and suffering or for their loss of enjoyment of life is unfair. It is cruel. It is quite frankly obscene in view of the fact that the

denial in Bill 68 of compensation for pain and suffering and for loss of enjoyment of life by innocent injured victims is designed only to create hardship for those victims and incredible new profits for the auto insurance industry, profits in the first year alone in excess of \$1 billion, every penny of that \$1 billion seized from innocent injured victims. That is what the threshold is all about.

It is so thoroughly, despicably dishonest to call this no-fault insurance when in fact what we are dealing with is threshold insurance. We have had no-faults in Ontario at the insistence of the NDP, and in the three western public schemes because of their very nature, for in excess of a decade. There is simply no doubt about it. What is new about Bill 68, and what creates the incredible new profits for the corporate insurance industry, big chunks of them not even Ontario residents—we are talking about an insurance industry big chunks of which are controlled by American megacorporations—is we are talking about a threshold system that is designed to prohibit, prevent or deny innocent injured victims the right to be compensated for pain and suffering or loss of enjoyment of life.

That means that not only, oh yes, the modest injury—and we have talked about this before—the sprained wrist, the sprained ankle, the minor cuts or bruises that heal promptly, will be denied any compensation, but so will the broken back, the broken arm, the broken legs, the fractured skull, the fractured ribs. They are going to be denied compensation because of this threshold. That is what this system is all about.

We categorically reject a threshold as a component of an insurance system that ought to be fair, that ought to be just, that ought to be reasonable. At the same time, we are so fearful of the drastic consequences that are going to flow from Bill 68 that it means we reluctantly support the amendments proposed with respect to loosening up or broadening or, if you will, liberalizing the threshold. The threshold that was created and drafted by the insurance industry in this province and by its Liberal lackeys is the most draconian, onerous, stringent threshold of any auto insurance system anywhere. It is more stringent, more demanding, more unjust than the threshold even of a jurisdiction like Michigan, upon which large parts of this bill were modelled.

The threshold that is drafted by the Liberals and that they want to ram through is going to create such hardship for so many people that, notwithstanding that we are fundamentally opposed to any threshold for pain and suffering or loss of enjoyment of life—that is to say, fundamentally opposed to the denial of compensation to any innocent injured victim—we are prepared to support and vote on behalf of some amendments proposed here which will ease some of the pain being imposed upon victims by the Liberals, which will soothe some of the gross discomfort being generated by the insurance industry and its hacks here at Queen's Park, which will not resolve that overriding injustice of there being any threshold but will indeed permit perhaps a few more people to be compensated than would be compensated otherwise.

The Liberals could have had all sorts of help but they scorned people, like Mr Justice Barr, who came before them with proposals. As Mr Justice Barr pointed out—and I am paraphrasing—“You're damn fools, you're idiots, for wanting to utilize a threshold, but if you've got to be that foolish, that stupid, that idiotic, that uncaring, at least loosen it up a little bit, at least soften the blow of the threshold.” Mr Justice Barr drafted a threshold similar to the amendments that are before this committee of the whole now. I am inclined to use somewhat visceral language sometimes in getting to the heart of the

issue. Mr Justice Barr was far more eloquent than I could ever be. Mr Justice Barr was far more precise than I could ever be. As a learned jurist, his criticism of this legislation was far more—

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I notice that the member for Welland-Thorold has been speaking for 15 minutes now. With respect, as the spokesperson for the Progressive Conservative caucus, I would in fairness ask consideration that we get an opportunity to place on the record our amendments. I recognize that the member for Welland-Thorold has had a number of hours on his feet in this House and I recognize the sincerity of his concern, but I too, on behalf of the disabled community particularly, would like to be able to place some amendments.

The Acting Chair: That is not really a point of order, but it is an interesting point of view. I have been listening carefully to the comments of the member for Welland-Thorold and they have been on the amendment under consideration, which is the no-fault principle. I would ask simply that the member for Welland-Thorold take your point of view under consideration in his remarks.

1640

Mr Kormos: I appreciate the interjection by my good friend the member for Mississauga South, for whom I have great respect and admiration, and I appreciate her concern that she will not have an opportunity to speak to these matters. As it is, I was just wrapping up my comments on threshold and no-faults. I wanted to make our position perfectly clear. I know that the member for Mississauga South is pleased that we will be supporting her amendments. I know she is virtually ecstatic about that.

With respect to this amendment, my remarks are as they are. It illustrates how inadequate this short period of time is for discussion of the legislation. I have to ask people, please, we are just not in a position to accept phone calls and fax messages this afternoon. It appears that some phone calls and fax messages have started coming in. We are only going to be doing this for another 45 minutes because that is all that the Liberals will let us. So I am not going to announce the phone numbers—obviously people recall them—but I should say they are of course welcome to call. I am pleased to hear from them. I am just surprised and amazed, and so thankful, that people once again are faxing in messages and telephoning us.

Mr Ferraro: I will try to be brief, bearing in mind the concerns of the member for Mississauga South.

I am absolutely delighted that the interjection will prohibit the Peter Kormos telethon from taking off again. I should tell the member opposite that the period in which he was filibustering the bill and had his telethon, people were suggesting that Tammy Faye had found a new partner. It got so bad that my father, who religiously watched the hearings of the House, has now become addicted to *The Young and the Restless*. In fact, a lot of people in Ontario think the member for Welland-Thorold had a serial on. Some people suggested that instead of calling it *The Young and the Restless*, they should call it the *Young and the Shameless*. Some people suggested there should be a theme song entitled *These Boots Are Made For Talking*.

But let me try to address more specifically some of the concerns alluded to. He is wrong. Purely and simply, he is wrong. I acknowledge the distinction in ideology between the socialist New Democratic Party and the free-enterprise-promoting Liberal Party of Ontario. We believe in the private sector,

the free enterprise system, and actively support it. I do not want to get into a debate, because it would take days and days, about the negative aspects of socialist insurance in other provinces and how millions and millions of dollars of taxpayers' money is used annually to subsidize. Indeed if there are innocent accident victims, the victims are the premium payers, quite frankly, because the majority if not all of the insureds pay, in some degree, for the bad driving records of others.

It is interesting that he talks, by innuendo, about members of my party being hacks of the insurance companies. That is regrettable and, I say with great respect to my friends opposite, it is totally unsubstantiated and regrettable that, in order to get a point across, or perhaps get a headline, they would so demean fellow members in this House and as such, I suggest with great respect, demean the position that the member opposite himself holds.

From a personal standpoint, I am a hack for no one. In the last election, I got \$700 from insurance companies and I got \$2,600 from lawyers. We all know what happens and how lawyers feel about this legislation. Having said all that, I think it should be proof positive that we are not in the pockets of anyone.

It is interesting that the member referred to American insurance megacorporations.

Mr Kormos: Over four million bucks in over two years.

The Acting Chair: Order. I would remind the member for Welland-Thorold of standing order 23. Perhaps, rather than disrupting the proceedings, he would care to read it.

Mr Mackenzie: He's being provoked, Mr Chairman. He's got to respond if someone's being provocative.

Mr Ferraro: If I am being provocative, Mr Chairman, I am not sure what the member opposite has been for the last few months. It is interesting that members opposite will quote on occasion the fact that the American, the respected man, Ralph Nader, has been here on occasion and has criticized our proposed bill. It is interesting to note, and I say factually, that Mr Nader, it is well-known fact, is employed by, to some degree is on contract with, the American Trial Lawyers Association. Now, would that imply that there is a conflict of interest? I suggest that is something for the people of Ontario as individuals to make their own subjective decisions on.

I want to say this, though: It is interesting—and this is factual—that when Mr Nader first came up here he did not even know that we had a system of OHIP in the province of Ontario. Yet members of the Opposition will stand up on occasion and pronounce how he is dead set against this, that indeed it obviously must be bad if Ralph Nader is against it, notwithstanding the fact that he may be perceived by some as having a bias in the situation. But I say, on a very personal note, that it is somewhat troublesome to me that we have to listen to the members of the opposition expound the words of an American as to how we should run our country. To me it is just something regrettable. That is just what we need, more Americans to talk about how we should run our country.

Mr Philip: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: The parliamentary assistant is in fact spreading misinformation about somebody who is fairly well respected in the world; namely, Ralph Nader. If Mr Nader did not know that there was a OHIP system in Ontario, how could he say that this was the worst system because—

The Acting Chair: Order. Will the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale please take his chair. That is not a point of order, and you have had ample time to express your point of view.

Mr Ferraro: I say with great candour to the member opposite that I have not spread any misinformation whatsoever. Indeed, I would be happy to substantiate what I have said about Mr Nader's comments thereon.

I have heard on occasion all too often the fact that there is a \$1-billion giveaway to insurance companies. It is absolutely false and wrong to even suggest such a thing. I am not sure, but I think even socialists understand the way business acumen works in a free enterprise province such as Ontario. If there is a cost associated with the operation of a business—I will even use their figures, and even then they are wrong—if there is \$1 billion in costs, the business owner passes that cost on to the consumer. So if there is cost they should pass it on, because quite frankly they are not in the business to go broke. Obviously the socialists cannot comprehend that form of free enterprise system, because they keep saying, "If there is not a cost, then automatically it never got passed on to the consumer." Of course we all know, and anyone of reasonable business acumen would understand, that if there are cost savings they will be passed on, to some degree, to the consumers.

Finally, I would say that Bill 68, in our view, is not only a balanced approach to dealing with the problem, the made-in-Ontario solution to dealing with the insurance issue, but indeed when it is passed, notwithstanding all the negatives and, to some degree, mistruths being portrayed and presented by members opposite, we will fully acknowledge and accept the challenge that the people of Ontario will for the most part be quite happy and relieved with Bill 68.

1650

Mrs Marland: This debate today is almost embarrassing. We are in a situation where the government has decided that the matter of automobile insurance in this province rates only two days of public debate by the members of this House. While we are in that process, I notice that we somehow have a system where the government gets to respond to each of the opposition members, so that means that a lot of time is being used, and can be used, by the government in response to each one of the opposition parties.

I am going to try to get to the important amendments that our Progressive Conservative caucus wants placed on the record as quickly as possible. I would like to tell the parliamentary assistant, the member for Guleph, that this is a far more serious matter before this House this afternoon than what his father watches on television. Frankly, I think it is a little insulting to the people of Ontario that he takes up the time of this House to tell us that his father is now watching *The Young and the Restless*. I say, with respect, that this debate, which is already confined and limited to two days only on this most serious matter, does not need to involve listening to the television viewing schedule of the father of the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions.

I would also like to place on the record that I do not know the answer to his response about whether or not he is a hack of the insurance industry. I only know that I held a public forum on automobile insurance. I know that at that public forum on automobile insurance in my riding the president of the Insurance Brokers Association of Ontario announced the increase in the weekly compensation from \$450, as written in the bill, up to the \$600 a week. Spurge Near made that announcement at

my public forum before the Minister of Financial Institutions made the announcement publicly. The day the news release—

Interjections.

The Acting Chair: Order. The member for Mississauga South has waited patiently to get the floor. I am sure the members would like to extend to her the same courtesy as has been extended to other members while they were trying to debate this issue.

Mrs Marland: The news release that was issued by the Minister of Financial Institutions on 28 February, where he announced the increase in the weekly compensation and the other benefits, and where he said the replacement benefit would be increased from \$450 to \$600, it was just a little curious that that announcement was made by the minister one or two days after the president of the Insurance Brokers Association of Ontario had made that announcement at my public forum on insurance.

People can draw their own conclusions about who knows what is going on. I am down here in Queen's Park every day. I certainly had not heard that was a possibility, and I would suggest that quite a number of the Liberal government backbenchers did not know it either. But the people in the inner circle of this Liberal provincial government, who are in the inner circle with the insurance brokers of Ontario, obviously have talked to each other. Frankly, I am somewhat insulted for the people who reside in Mississauga South, my riding, and the other people throughout this province who expect to hear announcements from the provincial government at least at the same time as those parties which are affected and involved by those announcements. I would suggest that yes, the insurance brokers of Ontario are involved and affected by those announcements, but are not the people of this province also affected and also entitled to know what is going on within the inner workings of this provincial Liberal government?

But no, in this case the insurance brokers of Ontario had prior knowledge and the inside track on a change in the legislation. I might add that when this bill was in committee the minister said there would be no major changes or amendments to this bill. Yet here was a major amendment that was not announced in committee but after all the public hearings were over. Yet we, the general public, had to hear about it from the insurance brokers of Ontario.

Because of the shortage of time, Mr Chairman, I would like for us to move to another Progressive Conservative amendment. Now I recognize that, for the amendment that is on the floor, the vote is being stacked for an hour from now. We have a number of very critical, serious amendments to Bill 68, but unfortunately we are not going to be able to place them all and get them recorded or even debated. So I would take your guidance as to how I can move to the next priority amendment for our Progressive Conservative caucus. I would perhaps suggest that we defer the amendment we are currently on, the amendment to subsection 231a(1) and that we defer dealing with the next amendments, to clause 231a(1)(a), and move to the following amendment, which is to clause 231a(1)(b). I would request that we now deal with that amendment.

The Acting Chair: The member for Mississauga South has requested that we defer discussion on the amendment dealing with clause 231a(1)(a) and that we move to the amendment dealing with clause 231a(1)(b). Is it the wish of the House that we so do?

Mr Philip: I think it would probably be a good suggestion, but I did have a couple of questions on this one section. Then

perhaps we can move on after that. It will take only two or three minutes. I am concerned about the exclusion for psychological damage. Therefore, I would be quite prepared to move along after that, if that would be agreed to.

The Acting Chair: Do we have agreement of the House that the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale will be able to place one or two questions and then we move on to clause 231a(1)(b)?

Agreed to.

Mr Philip: I appreciate the co-operation on this from the member for Mississauga South.

The parliamentary assistant to the minister was boasting earlier about how a university student standing on the street corner who gets knocked over and loses a year of university will now get paid. Will he tell us exactly how much—just in case someone is viewing and does not know exactly the amount—that university student will get if he loses a year of schooling? How much per week?

Mr Ferraro: The minimum is \$185 per week.

Mr Philip: Can the parliamentary assistant tell us what the minimum wage is in Ontario at the present time?

Mr Ferraro: In response to that, I wish to point out that under the present legislation that university student would get nothing. Indeed, the \$185 is exclusive of any deductions; comparable in essence, I am told, to the minimum wage in Ontario, which I think would be the equivalent of about \$235 gross.

Mr Philip: Under the present system the student could sue for the loss of his year. He would get, at the very least, some compensation for pain and suffering. Part of the consideration would be the fact that he would lose one year of salary, either at the beginning or at the end of his career, as a result of this accident. He would get a heck of a lot more than the minimum wage, which is what this is giving.

Mr D. W. Smith: How do you know, Ed?

Mr Philip: I ask him, does he feel that the students in Ontario are worth less than the minimum wage? Because this is what he is doing and what he has the audacity to boast about.

1700

Mr Ferraro: Notwithstanding that the member opposite is getting somewhat exercised over less-than-factual information, in my view, let me try to relieve some of the concerns that might be derived by the public which might be watching at this point in time.

Under the present system, if a student gets into an accident, he essentially gets nothing. If indeed he can go to court, wait the four or five years and prove that he is not at fault, which in itself may be a problem—or if he cannot prove it at all, then he does not have that access to court and he gets absolutely nothing. And what happens if a student is at fault in an accident? He gets zero, quite frankly.

Under the proposed system, students get a minimum of \$185. Perhaps more important, they would get quick, substantive action and access to \$1 million in rehabilitative care. Such notable orthopaedic surgeons as Hamilton Hall say it is important if not imperative that quick rehabilitative care be applied in order to restore that individual to the situation that individual was in before the accident.

For the member opposite to suggest that the present system is better than what is being proposed, I suggest, is wrong. In-

deed, there is no doubt in my mind and in the mind of our government that the individuals involved in accidents will be treated much more equitably and fairly under the proposed system.

Mr Philip: It is interesting that he has not referred to what they get in other, real, no-fault systems rather than in this phoney, so-called no-fault system that he has. What he is telling the students in Ontario is that if, through no fault of their own as they are on their way to York University or the University of Toronto, they get knocked over by a drunk driver or somebody who is completely negligent, they have lost their right to sue, and for their compensation for all their pain and suffering and everything they are going through, plus losing a year's salary, they are going to get less than the minimum wage. That is what this bill does, and he has the audacity to boast about that. I say that is shameful. No wonder the students, the consumers and every group other than his bosses, the insurance companies, are against this legislation.

Mr Ferraro: Whatever it was the member said, suffice it to say that he is wrong. There is no compensation whatsoever right now for students. In the event that they are not at fault and they want access to tort, and indeed they can wait four or five years to get, conceivably, a favourable ruling from the judge, which in itself is hypothetical, and assuming they can afford from a mental, physical and financial standpoint to wait that period of time, yes, they might get some remuneration.

I suggest that for every example the member opposite can show of what he described as an injustice I can give him an example of an elderly couple who waited four years for a settlement, and when they got their settlement of \$85,000 four years later, after having gone through the trauma, the expense and the anguish of waiting that long, the legal expense was \$87,000—in excess of what the courts actually granted. Is that fair and equitable? Is that justice? I suggest that the member opposite is absolutely wrong.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order, please. My understanding was that the honourable member for Etobicoke-Rexdale would be allowed one or two questions. I know the honourable member for Mississauga South will allow the honourable member for Lake Nipigon one brief question and then we will continue with her proposed amendment.

Mr Pouliot: I thank the member for being most gracious.

On the same proposed amendment, perhaps the parliamentary assistant will remember somewhat vividly that we had a conversation regarding the minimum wage, which is currently \$5 an hour, vis-à-vis the compensation that was originally proposed by the government in the context of Bill 68. I remember specifically that he did readily acquiesce. He said, "Yes, something has to be done," the rationale, the substance being that if he were outside these walls, it would be against the law to compensate, because we were talking about lost opportunity, lost ability to earn wages. Ironically, if he were outside these walls, he could not, because the law would say that he must compensate for labour a minimum of \$5 an hour.

It is not his fault, but in lieu of this the government has minimum recognition that there is any such terminology. The parliamentary assistant said, "What is being proposed is just not enough, and we will upgrade it to make it at least more than minimum wage." He did so with the case of Maria. Does he remember Maria? We did it together. She is the Portuguese lady

who was cleaning the rooms of the Royal York and got run over and was deprived of her right to make a living.

He said: "Well, there is a human dimension. We are talking about real people." Yet when we crossed the street right this afternoon—Maria's son, in this case hypothetically, goes to university, and we know what the cost of going to university is. Unless it is catastrophic and permanent, we say that in most cases it has been determined that you will not have recourse, you will not have access to the court or the right to sue.

In this day and age, the parliamentary assistant knows how much it costs to live. He has children himself. I am trying to be fair here. But \$185 a week is not 40 hours at a designated workplace constituting a week's work. That would give you \$200 a week under the very minimum minimum wage.

It is not a matter of playing tough here. The government has invoked closure. They have allowed for only two days. I can accept that there were other circumstances associated with this measure, but what I cannot understand is that they lack consistency in their approach. Is the member listening? I will pay him the compliment of listening to his answer, and I hope it has the same sincerity attached to it.

In concluding, \$185 a week does not even mean the minimum wage. It is not consistent. The government is skate-board-ing and forgetting one very important segment. Their rationale is, since these people do not make a wage, since they do not work—for if they were to work, they would at least get the minimum wage—since they are not considered "the workforce," they will compensate them at less than minimum wage, although they are university students, although the minimum wage would only guarantee them \$10,000 a year.

I am interested in the parliamentary assistant's response.

Mr Ferraro: I say to my friend opposite, I know he is sincere. We have discussed this at length, and I was listening. I really was. Let me respond in this way and I will try to clarify, I think, some of the apprehension that he sincerely believes.

First of all, I say to my friend opposite, a student now gets zero, absolutely zero from a no-fault benefits standpoint. I acknowledge that, indeed, if they are so inclined under the present system, and mentally and physically and financially want to have the access to the court system, it exists now.

I suggest to you, Mr Chairman, it is in those less serious cases more important that we provide an income replacement and rehabilitative care and access to the necessary medical treatment required by that student to get that student back into the position he was in before the accident than to allow him the access to the courts in that regard.

The member is wrong in that he says it is not minimum wage. The \$185—and maybe he is not listening now—is net of deductions. The aggregate amount is \$235. The minimum wage, using his own figures, would be \$200. So I say with respect to my friend opposite that indeed it is comparable, if not slightly above minimum wage and, I acknowledge, not high enough perhaps. But it goes without saying that his concern in that regard may be somewhat alleviated.

The Second Deputy Chair: Mrs Marland moves that clause 231a(1)(b) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"(b) permanent or serious impairment caused by physical, psychological or mental injury."

Mrs Marland: I think what has to be really significant is that we had a number of very important amendments to this bill in the Progressive Conservative Party.

The way the time is fleeting in this minimal short-change of two days of debate—we should be very clear, for the sake of the public and for the sake of the record, that two days of debate does not mean two days; it means two sessions of approximately two and a half hours each. So we are looking at having a total of five hours spent on this legislation whereby we have an opportunity to amend this seriously flawed bill.

1710

I know my colleague the member for Leeds-Grenville, who is the spokesperson for the Ministry of Financial Institutions, is sharing the same level of frustration that I am that here we are, trying to represent the interests of the people of this province, when the current provincial Liberal government does not, and it brings forward a bill that is as seriously flawed as Bill 68 is. Here we are with our significant number of amendments and we are having to select. We are trying to prioritize.

In dealing with this particular amendment, I think it is important to explain that the threshold definition currently in this bill specifically excludes emotional and mental injury. When emotional and mental injuries are compensated under our Ontario health insurance plan and recognized by anyone in the health care field—all the specialists, all the physicians and certainly all the people, obviously, in the Ministry of Health, because emotional and mental injuries are eligible under OHIP—how is it that this Liberal government drafts a piece of legislation where suddenly they do not exist, they do not matter any more and they are not rated?

People who sustain that kind of injury now are nobody. How ludicrous, how shameful, how irresponsible can this Liberal government be? It is totally disgusting that the people of Ontario who have emotional and mental injuries as a result of automobile accidents are suddenly disfranchised. These people are betrayed.

In fact, I would like to quote from the Canadian Paraplegic Association, which did appear before the legislative committee. They have put their concerns on record, but again this Liberal government chose to ignore them. The major concerns of the Canadian Paraplegic Association are with the inadequacies in the definition of the threshold above which a person injured in an accident would receive compensation for loss or damage.

Section 231a of the bill establishes the threshold to be:

“(a) permanent serious disfigurement; or

“(b) permanent serious impairment of an important bodily function caused by continuing injury which is physical in nature.”

“Physical in nature.” Since when does the other kind of injury not matter? William Hoch, the executive director of the Canadian Paraplegic Association, said in the hearings on 10 January 1990—we are talking about four months ago—that “permanent serious” should read “permanent or serious,” “continuing” should be omitted, and either “physical in nature” should be omitted or “mental, emotional or psychological” should be added to “physical” in that phrase.

I also want to refer to Barbara Turnbull, who is a constituent of mine. Barbara is a quadriplegic. Most people know the tragic story about Barbara and the injuries she sustained being shot at while she worked at a Mac's milk store. The injuries she sustained rendered her a quadriplegic six years ago. This is a very courageous, wonderful young woman who is an inspiration to all of us.

Barbara Turnbull appeared before this legislative committee and reiterated the Canadian Paraplegic Association's concerns with the threshold during her presentation to the legislative

committee. She even went further and met with the Minister of Financial Institutions herself. She stressed that the benefits paid under the plan must be indexed to the inflation rate and should be available as a lump sum rather than in periodic payments.

This Liberal government minister ignored someone who had been there. She lives every day with that injury that she sustained in a very brutal manner, albeit not as a result of an automobile accident, but the same kind of debilitating injury that people who are in automobile accidents do sustain.

This is where the irony is. We have a situation with this bill where an at-fault driver can cause an injury to me or my passengers, yet the injury may not pass the threshold of this bill and therefore we cannot sue for compensation. But I can pull up at the service station with those passengers in my car and they can step out of the vehicle and sustain an injury on the property of that service station, or on other public or private property—they may run into a department store; they may be on some municipal sidewalk—they can sustain an injury for which they can in turn sue for justifiable compensation, but not if they are injured in the car. What a fallacy. Did anybody ever think that any government would come up with anything that was so unreasonable and so ridiculous and so terribly unjust?

I want to continue, just to put on the record something else that the Canadian Paraplegic Association said, because I think we have to remember that when we are talking about automobile insurance and accidents resulting from being in an automobile accident, when we buy insurance we are not buying insurance for the fender benders. If we were, we would be smarter to put our \$1,000, \$1,200, \$1,400 or \$1,500 that we spend on insurance in the bank and let it gain some interest for us. We are buying insurance to protect us against the worst possible cases.

I would suggest that when William Hoch speaks for the Canadian Paraplegic Association those people know at first hand what the worst possible circumstances are. He said:

“Without these changes, many victims who suffer serious economic losses as a result of automobile accidents will receive insufficient compensation or possibly no compensation at all. Why should a victim who suffers a very serious but not permanent injury be denied assistance? As well, why should there be a distinction between physical and mental, psychological and emotional disability? Any disability sustained as a result of an accident may cause severe loss or damage. It is also important that victims receive a lump-sum payment to cover the enormous costs of home and vehicle modifications, attendant care and the education required so that they may secure employment.”

When I was speaking on this subject, I also added to Mr Hoch's comments that large expenditures in these areas are essential for those suffering injuries to enjoy some quality of life. According to the Canadian Paraplegic Association, a \$1.2-million to \$1.5-million lump-sum payment provides a subsistent but reasonable level of existence to its clients.

Also, nowhere do we see a willingness of this government to have indexation for inflation. So in regard to the great announcements about what kind of compensation these people who cannot sue are going to have to depend on, that amount of money is limited.

The Second Deputy Chair: One minute.

Mrs Marland: Mr Chairman, I was not aware that we were limiting our comments to the amendments. The member for Welland-Thorold earlier this afternoon spoke for 23 minutes

without being timed, and at this point I have been speaking since—

1720

The Second Deputy Chair: Not quite 10 minutes, actually.

Mrs Marland: Pardon?

The Second Deputy Chair: You have not been speaking for 10 minutes yet.

Mrs Marland: No.

The Second Deputy Chair: But I have been watching the time. I did not realize the member for Welland-Thorold had spoken for 23 minutes. When I was in the chair I let him speak for 10 minutes, because in terms of the committee of the whole House, our procedure is questions and comments.

Mrs Marland: I know.

The Second Deputy Chair: I let him comment for 10 minutes; now I am letting you comment for 10 minutes. If the previous Chair let him go on, I apologize for that, but I think in terms of what we are trying to accomplish by 5:30, I will give you two more minutes, allow a response, allow a rotation and then you might, if we can work this out, have the opportunity of concluding.

Mrs Marland: Okay. I recognize it is a problem when we are changing Chairs and you are not aware of what had gone on before you. But I think, in fairness, this party has not had any opportunity to place anything on the record.

I want to also add, in speaking to the amendment that I have now placed, that the requirement that the injury be physical in nature is discriminatory. Psychological injuries including depression, anxiety and pain disorders are real and legitimately disabling. I also want to quote from subsection 15(1) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which states, and this is terribly important to this debate, even if the Liberal government does not want to listen, "Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability."

If the Charter of Rights and Freedoms can recognize mental disability, how is it that this Liberal government drafts a bill that excludes those people from their rights?

Mr Faubert: Nonsense.

Mrs Marland: I would be embarrassed to be the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, who says "Nonsense." I hope his constituents remember those constituents who are emotionally and psychologically injured and debilitated who cannot have access because they cannot pass the threshold.

There is a good chance that Bill 68 is inconsistent with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is the opinion expressed by Gordon Henderson, a noted constitutional expert and former colleague of the Attorney General. I know that my colleague the member for Leeds-Grenville has asked that this bill be referred for a constitutional opinion. The very fact that in the Constitution it says there shall be no discrimination against people with mental disability—how is it that this Liberal government can say that those kinds of injuries are not eligible under this legislation?

I think that this whole process of this Bill 68 is a shameful representation of a government not listening to its people. If the basic reason for Bill 68 is that we deal with the inflating cost of

automobile insurance in this province, then let's deal with it. But this does not stop the inflation of the insurance rates. In fact, they have already told us that this year the insurance rates will increase 8% to 9% in the greater Toronto area. What do we get for it? We get less protection, we get less opportunity for compensation of injuries that we or others sustain through being involved with automobile accidents.

I recognize that the time is so limited that I have to relinquish the floor, but if there is no other amendment in this entire bill that this Liberal government will accept, I plead that it recognizes that psychological and mental injury, which it recognizes through OHIP and any other claim under the health system, I plead with it on behalf of each one of us and all the 9.5 million people whom we represent in this province to support at least this amendment, because if it does not, there but for the grace of God go any one of us or our families, friends, constituents in this province who sustain that kind of injury and yet are not eligible to pass the threshold of Bill 68.

Mr Ferraro: Thank you for the opportunity to respond. I will do it somewhat briefly.

The member opposite, whom I respect very much, I am sure is sincere in what she says. I acknowledge that. But let me say without hesitation, in my view she does not fully understand what Bill 68 is all about.

If I might digress for a minute, because she has alluded to it on a number of occasions, she has seriously questioned the fact that we have only had two days for debate. That is regrettable and I know the members on the government side feel every bit as bad about it. But the reality of the situation is this: The record shows there was a filibuster on in this House that went on for 40 hours. The co-operation was not there that would allow normal, logical and much-needed debate from all parties in this House. That is factual. Having said all that, the government must proceed in the best interests of the people of Ontario. Unfortunately, we were limited subsequently to only two days' debate.

The member for Mississauga South made a point, as have others, about talking about people whom we all admire and respect, such as Barbara Turnbull—quadriplegics, paraplegics, people with debilitating and serious injuries and handicapped people. Indeed, as members from all parties will acknowledge, during the public hearings many, many people came in and made presentations. I say without question that most if not all of those people would still qualify for access to tort under this system. That is factual; without question that is factual. Nothing has changed, save and except they will be treated in a more humane and expeditious fashion. They not only still retain access to sue, access to court, but they will get access to income replacement and the no-fault benefits not only significantly or tremendously enhanced but indeed in a much quicker time frame. Those people whom the member opposite should be talking about at greater length are those people who have less serious injuries or who have emotional or psychological injury, and that has so often been discussed.

Let me say without equivocation that it does not preclude those people from access to the courts when there is a physical nexus attached to that mental or psychological injury. They can still sue, and that is factual. But those people, an admittedly substantively larger portion of those people who have psychological or physical injuries that are less serious, will have access not only to enhanced income replacement but to significantly enhanced rehabilitative and long-term care necessities.

Let me be more specific, if I may, because the opposition would suggest that these people have absolutely no access to compensation or access to courts, when I have said that they still have in certain cases access to courts. Supplementary medical? They get medical, psychological, surgical, dental, hospital, chiropractic, any necessary prosthesis, home renovations, transportation, as well as long-term care. If they need somebody to stay in their home, they get up to \$3,000 a month so that a care giver will be there to look after those people who are somewhat debilitated until they are back on their feet.

We cannot accept this amendment. This amendment is more along the lines of the Michigan threshold system. This is a made-in-Ontario system. We acknowledge that this system would have, without question, a significant increase in premiums and that is something that the members opposite do not want to acknowledge, the cost factor involved in this. That is a reality. We would not even be talking about insurance if there was not an affordability and availability crisis in this province. We have addressed it.

1730

The retention of access to tort still exists. The enhanced rehabilitation long-term care and no-fault benefits are substantively increased. Those people will get access to those no-fault benefits within 10 to 30 days. We stand on Bill 68 on the fact that the vast majority of people in Ontario and indeed the vast majority if not all of the drivers of Ontario will be treated in a much fairer, more equitable and certainly without question and, perhaps more important, more humane manner.

Mr Kormos: I am going to end up this committee of the whole with the briefest of comments, and it is in an effort to reveal the Tom Pepperism that has been coming from the government members, where there is a veritable Ananias over there speaking on behalf of the government, the member for Guelph. We have seen prevarication after prevarication.

I also want to thank those people who once again telephoned in to the lobby here—the security staff spent a little bit of time answering the phones—and who called into my office. It is incredible, but the fact remains that people are still listening anxiously to this debate notwithstanding that it is being strangled and that the breath is being choked out of it by the Liberal majority.

One of the faxes I got this afternoon indicates that a confidential source from the insurance industry called to let us know about the new rates under this Liberal scheme. The rates given are from Commercial Union for a class 026 primary driver, which apparently is a good driver with a good record. This is for territory 16, which is London, Ontario. The old rate is \$431. The new rate that Commercial Union proposes to charge that same driver after Bill 68 is \$592, a 37% increase. So much for the government's claims about reductions or stability: a 37% premium increase in London, Ontario. That happens to be the truth, rather than the lies that have been coming from this government.

Mr Runciman: I certainly appreciate the opportunity of a few brief comments in respect to this element of the legislation which we think is perhaps the most onerous and the most harmful to innocent accident victims in this province.

I have only a minute or two, but I want to recall, for the members of the committee who sat on this and the members of the House who did not, the testimony of 18-year-old Jeremy Rempel, who appeared before the committee, an innocent accident victim who had suffered severe head injuries and was con-

cerned about this element, which restricts compensation to those who have suffered physical injuries only and does not recognize those individuals who are going to suffer head injuries, psychological trauma etc, as a result of an automobile accident in this province.

Jeremy Rempel is someone who had no vested interest but was very much concerned about innocent accident victims in this province in the future. This government has decided, in an effort to keep costs down, to stabilize costs and to benefit the insurance industry in this province, to restrict those people from having an opportunity for access to the courts. That is the reality. Who benefits from this legislation? The reality is, if you look at the people who appeared before this committee, the only witnesses supportive of this legislation were either representatives of the insurance industry or those affiliated with the industry.

This legislation hurts people. Jeremy Rempel, an innocent accident victim, recognized that. He appealed to us; he appealed to the Liberal members, the NDP members, the Conservative members. The Liberal members of that committee, the Liberal members of this Legislature, ignored Jeremy Rempel, ignored the many thousands of innocent accident victims who will suffer in the future under this legislation.

The Second Deputy Chair: By agreement on Monday, it was decided that we would pursue the clause-by-clause passage of Bill 68 contrary to the order of the House, which was 5:45 pm, but in the interest of the number of amendments we have and the length of the bill. So with that mind and also with further discussion, it was suggested—if the parliamentary assistant would just listen for a moment—that we could possibly have some block voting, which would dispense with a lot of sections quickly. What I would suggest is that for sections 1 and 2, we will call the two sections, call members in and then once we have the members in on the bell we could continue with our voting.

Sections 1 and 2:

The Second Deputy Chair: Is it the pleasure of the House that sections 1 and 2 of Bill 68 carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Call in the members.

1742

The Second Deputy Chair: Order. To remind members of the procedure that is taking place, this is committee of the whole House on Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance, as according to designation of the order of the House, time allocation, but through agreement of all parties we are going to attempt to vote various sections in blocks.

I would like to remind all members that we have a number of proposed amendments and they will have to be patient with the table, so that we work our way through the bill and the amendments. [See appendix, page 1273, for amendments deemed to have been moved.]

We have called you in, first, for a vote on sections 1 and 2 of Bill 68.

The committee divided on whether sections 1 and 2 should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes 75; nays 24.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Section 3:

The Second Deputy Chair: We have a proposed government amendment to section 6h of the act. Of course, under the orders of the House, it is deemed to have been read.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Vote stacked.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to section 6h of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to add section 6na to the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 3, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 3, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether sections 4 to 36, inclusive, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Sections 4 to 36, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 37:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendments to clauses 98(1)(bg), (bh), (bl), (bm), (bn), (bo) and (bp) of the act, which were agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 37, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 37, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether sections 38 to 44, inclusive, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Sections 38 to 44, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 45:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsections 45(10) and 45(11), which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 45, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 45, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether section 46 should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 46 agreed to.

Section 47:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to add subsection 208a(6) to the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendments to subsections 208b(1), 208c(1) and 208c(3) of the act, which were agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Runciman's amendment to clause 208c(4)(d) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Runciman's amendment to subsection 208c(5) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 208c(5) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 47, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 47, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether section 48 should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 48 agreed to.

Section 49:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to section 209a of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 49 should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 49 agreed to.

The committee divided on whether sections 50 to 54, inclusive, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Sections 50 to 54, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 55:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to add subsection 230a(9) to the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 55, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 55, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether section 56 should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 56 agreed to.

1750

Section 57:

The committee divided on Mr R. F. Johnson's amendment to subsection 231a(1) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Runciman's amendment to subsection 231a(1)(a) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mrs Marland's amendment to clause 231a(1)(b) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Runciman's amendment to subsection 231a(4) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to add subsection 231a(7) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Runciman's amendment to clause 231b(1)(c) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Runciman's amendment to clause 231b(1)(d) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Runciman's amendment to subsection 231b(6) of the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Runciman's amendment to add subsections 232(1a), (1b) and (1c) to the act, which was negated on the same vote reversed.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 232(2) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 232(5) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 57, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 57, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether sections 58 to 62, inclusive, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 63:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to section 239a of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 239b(1) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to add subsections 239b(4) and 239b(5) to the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 63, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 63, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether section 64 should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 64 agreed to.

Section 65:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsections 242a(2) and 242a(3) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 242a(5) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 242b(8) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 242c(1a) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsections 242e(2) and (3) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to sections 242f, 242g and 242h of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to section 242k of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 65, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 65, as amended, agreed to.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order, please. The House leader for the opposition is correct. We are in theory trying to have a vote and we are trying to be quick and facilitate this as quickly as possible.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: I say to the honourable members of the official opposition, you are not helping matters much.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Let's have the minister take his seat.

The Second Deputy Chair: Let's carry on now.

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: Now I have totally forgotten where I am. We can now vote in a block on sections 66 to 73.

The committee divided on whether sections 66 to 73, inclusive, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Sections 66 to 73, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 74:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 369(5a) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to clause 372(1)(a) of the act, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 74, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 74, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether sections 75 to 81, inclusive, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Sections 75 to 81, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 82:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 82(4), which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 82, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 82, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether sections 83 to 85, inclusive, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Sections 83 to 85, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 86:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to subsection 86(2) of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 86, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 86, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether sections 87 to 90, inclusive, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Sections 87 to 90, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 91:

The committee divided on Mr Ferraro's amendment to section 91, which was agreed to on the same vote.

The committee divided on whether section 91, as amended, should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Section 91, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on whether sections 92 and 93 should stand as part of the bill, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Sections 92 and 93 agreed to.

The committee divided on whether the bill, as amended, should be reported, which was agreed to on the same vote.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

The committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again. Shall the report be received and adopted?

All those in favour will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Agreed to.

Hon Mr Ward: Mr Speaker, I would request unanimous consent to revert to motions.

Agreed to.

MOTION

The Speaker: Mr Ward moves that the standing committee on administration of justice be authorized to meet in the morning of Thursday 17 May 1990 for the purpose of organization.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Mr Ward: I wish to advise the House of a change in the order of business. Tomorrow, in the afternoon session, we will be dealing with second reading of Bill 107.

The Speaker: It now being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned—listen carefully—until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 1802.

APPENDIX

INSURANCE STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 1989

As part of an order of the House in relation to Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance, the following amendments were deemed to have been moved:

Section 3:

That section 6h of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 3 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsection:

(3) The regulations made in respect of an assessment made under subsection (1) in respect of expenses and expenditures for dispute resolution under sections 242b to 242f may provide that the assessment may be based on such degree of usage of the dispute resolution system as may be provided in the regulations.

That section 3 of the bill be amended by adding thereto, as a section of the Insurance Act:

6na. Subject to the procedures and time limits for the conduct of arbitrations set out in the regulations, the director may make rules for the practice and procedure to be observed for a proceeding before him or her or before an arbitrator.

Section 37:

That clauses 98(1)(bg) and (bh) of the Insurance Act, as set out in subsection 37(2) of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(bg) establishing requirements that must be met before an insurer declines to issue, terminates or refuses to renew a contract of automobile insurance or refuses to provide or continue any coverage or endorsement in respect thereof;

(bh) prescribing grounds for which an insurer cannot decline to issue, terminate or refuse to renew a contract of automobile insurance or refuse to provide or continue any coverage or endorsement in respect thereof;

(bha) prescribing coverages and endorsements for the purposes of section 208b.

That clauses 98(1)(bl), (bm), (bn), (bo) and (bp) of the Insurance Act, as set out in subsection 37(2) of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(bl) providing for and governing indemnification and subrogation where section 230a applies;

(bm) prescribing any activity or failure to act that constitutes an unfair or deceptive act or practice under subclause 393(b)(xii) and prescribing requirements that, if not complied with, constitute an unfair or deceptive act or practice;

(bn) prescribing classes of persons, classes of automobiles and terms, conditions, provisions, exclusions and limits for the purposes of subsection 239b(1);

(bo) prescribing rules of procedure and setting time limits in respect of mediation, arbitration, appeal and variation proceedings under sections 242b to 242f.

Section 45:

That subsections 45(10) and (11) of the bill be struck out.

Section 47:

That section 208a of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 47 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsection:

(6) This section comes into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor.

That subsection 208b(1) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 47 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(1) If so required by the regulations and unless the insurer has complied therewith, an insurer shall not decline to issue or terminate or refuse to renew a contract in respect of such coverages and endorsements as may be set out in the regulations or decline to issue, terminate or refuse to renew any contract or refuse to provide or continue any coverage or endorsement on any ground set out in the regulations.

That subsection 208c(1) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 47 of the bill, be amended by adding at the end "or for which the insurer refuses to provide or continue a coverage or endorsement."

That subsection 208c(3) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 47 of the bill, be amended by inserting after "contract" in the second line "or refuse to provide or continue a coverage or endorsement."

That subsection 208c(4d) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 47 of the bill, be amended by inserting after the word "policy" the following: "such as the practice of 'cherry-picking,' whereby insurers are highly selective with offers of insurance coverage in the voluntary market, thus forcing consumers to seek very expensive coverage through the province's insurer of last resort, the Facility Association."

That subsection 208c(5) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 47 of the bill, be amended by adding the following:

(c) may order an insurer to reimburse all funds owed to insureds, resulting from improper underwriting practices as set out in subsection (4).

That subsection 208c(s) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

(5) Following a hearing with respect to a ground, the commissioner, (a) may prohibit an insurer from declining to issue, terminating or refusing to renew any contract or from refusing to provide or continue any coverage or endorsement on that ground; or (b) may prohibit an insurer from applying that ground, in the manner specified by the commissioner, to decline to issue, terminate or refuse to renew any contract or refuse to provide or continue any coverage or endorsement.

Section 49:

That section 209a of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 49 of the bill, be amended by striking out "operating" in the fifth line and substituting in lieu thereof "driving."

Section 55:

That section 230a of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 55 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsections:

(9) This section does not apply if both automobiles are owned by the same person.

(10) This section does not apply to damage to an automobile owned by the insured or its contents if the damage is caused by the insured while driving another automobile.

Section 57:

That subsection 231a(1) of the Insurance Act, exclusive of the clauses, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(1) In respect of non-economic loss or non-economic damage arising directly or indirectly from the use or operation, after this section comes into force, of an automobile and despite any other act, no owner of an automobile, no occupant of an automobile and no person present at the incident is liable in an action in Ontario for non-economic loss or non-economic damage from bodily injury arising from such use or operation in Canada, the United States of America, or any other jurisdiction designated in the no-fault benefits schedule involving the automobile unless, as a result of such use or operation, the person has died or has sustained,

That clause 231a(1)(a) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be amended by inserting the word "or" between the words "permanent" and "serious."

That clause 231a(1)(b) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(b) permanent or serious impairment caused by physical, psychological or mental injury.

That subsection 231a(4) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be struck out.

That section 231a of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsection:

(7) For the purposes of this section, "owner" includes an operator as defined in subsection 15a(1) of the Highway Traffic Act.

That clause 231b(1)(c) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be struck out.

That clause 231b(1)(d) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be struck out.

That subsection 231b(6) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be struck out.

That section 232 of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsections:

(1a) On the first day of January in each year, beginning in 1990, an indexing factor shall be determined, based on the percentage change in the consumer price index for Canada for all items, for the 12-month period ending the 31st day of October of the previous year, as published by Statistics Canada.

(1b) On the first day of January in each year, beginning in 1990, the commission shall adjust the dollar amounts for benefits set out in the no-fault benefits schedule by applying the indexing factor to the amount set out in the no-fault benefits schedule (in the case of the 1990 adjustment) or as adjusted under this section on the preceding first day of January (in the case of subsequent adjustments).

(1c) A person entitled to no-fault benefits is entitled to receive the benefits in accordance with the adjustments determined under this section.

That subsection 232(2) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be amended as follows:

1. By inserting "i or" after "subparagraph" in the first line of subparagraph iii of paragraph 1.

2. By inserting "i, ii or" after "subparagraph" in the first line of subparagraph iv of paragraph 1.

3. By striking out "subparagraph ii, or if there is doubt as to which automobile struck the non-occupant" in the second and third lines of subparagraph iii of paragraph 2 and substituting "subparagraph i or ii."

4. By inserting "i, ii or" after "subparagraph" in the first line of subparagraph iv of paragraph 2.

That section 232(5) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 57 of the bill, be amended by inserting after "dependant" in the third line "as defined in the no-fault benefits schedule."

Section 63:

That section 239a of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 63 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

239a. Payments made or available to a person under the no-fault benefits schedule constitute, to the extent of such payments, a release by the person, the person's personal representative, the person's insurer or any one claiming through or under the person or by virtue of part V of the Family Law Act, 1986 of any claim under subsection 231(1) or 232(1).

That subsection 239b(1) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 63 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(1) The insurer responsible under subsection 232(2) for the payment of no-fault benefits to such classes of persons as may be named in the regulations is entitled, subject to such terms, conditions, provisions, exclusions and limits as may be prescribed, to indemnification in relation to such benefits paid by it from the insurers of such class or classes of automobiles as may be named in the regulations involved in the incident from which the responsibility to pay the no-fault benefits arose.

That section 239b of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 63 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsection:

(4) If the insurers are unable to agree with respect to indemnification under this section, the dispute shall be resolved through arbitration under the Arbitrations Act.

(5) No arbitration hearing shall be held with respect to indemnification under this section if there is an unsettled claim against any of the insurers by an insured in respect of the incident for which indemnification is sought.

Section 65:

That subsections 242a(2) and (3) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 65 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(2) Any restriction on a party's right to mediate, litigate, arbitrate, appeal or apply to vary an order as provided in sections 242b to 242f is void except where the restriction forms part of a settlement.

(3) For the purposes of this section and sections 242b to 242f, "insured person" includes a person who is claiming funeral expenses or a death benefit under the no-fault benefits schedule.

That subsection 242a(5) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 65 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(5) If an insurer or an insured is represented in any mediation, arbitration, appeal or variation proceeding under sections 242b to 242f, the mediator, arbitrator or director, as the case may be, may adjourn the proceeding, with or without conditions, if the representative is not authorized to bind the party he or she represents.

That subsection 242b(8) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 65 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(8) If mediation fails, the mediator, in addition to any notice required to be given, shall prepare and give to the parties a report setting out the insurer's last offer and the mediator's description of the issues that remain in dispute.

That section 242c of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 65 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsection:

(1a) No person may bring a proceeding in any court or refer a matter to arbitration unless mediation has first been sought and has failed.

That subsections 242e(2) and (3) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 65 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(2) A notice of appeal shall be in writing and shall be delivered to the commission within 30 days after the date of the arbitrator's order and the appellant shall serve the notice on the respondent.

(3) The director may extend the time for requesting an appeal, either before or after the 30 days, if the director is satisfied that there are apparent grounds for granting relief to the person and that there are reasonable grounds for applying for the extension, and the director may give such directions as he or she considers proper consequent upon the extension.

That sections 242f, 242g and 242h of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 65 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

242f.—(1) Either the insured person or the insurer may apply to the director to vary or revoke an order made by an arbitrator or the director.

(2) If an application is made to vary or revoke an arbitrator's order, the director may decide the matter or he or she may appoint the same arbitrator or some other arbitrator to determine it.

(3) If the arbitrator or director is satisfied that there has been a material change in the circumstances of the insured or that evidence not available on the arbitration or appeal has become available or that there is an error in the order, the arbitrator or director may vary or revoke the order and may make a new order if he or she considers it advisable to do so.

(4) An order made, varied or revoked under subsection (3) may be prospective or retroactive.

242g.—(1) The director may state a case in writing for the opinion of the Divisional Court upon any question that, in his or her opinion, is a question of law.

(2) The Divisional Court shall hear and determine the stated case.

242h. An arbitrator cannot vary or revoke an order made by him or her and cannot make a new order to replace an order made by him or her if the order is under appeal.

242i. An insurer shall not, after an order of the director or of an arbitrator, reduce benefits to an insured person on the basis of an alleged change of circumstances, alleged new evidence or an alleged error, unless the insured person agrees or unless the director or an arbitrator so orders in a variation or appeal proceeding under sections 242e or 242f.

242j. The director shall review arbitration orders and may recommend to the superintendent that the superintendent investigate the business practices of an insurer if the director is of the opinion that any arbitration or appeal from an arbitration reveals unfair or deceptive business practices.

That section 65 of the bill be amended by adding the following section:

242k. At least once every two years, the minister shall table a report before the assembly in respect of the adequacy of no-fault benefits and setting out changes made to the no-fault benefits schedule since the last report and changes that are proposed to the no-fault benefits schedule at the time of the report.

Section 74:

That section 369 of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 74 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsection:

(5a) The commissioner may approve the application before the expiry of the 60-day period.

That clause 372(1)(a) of the Insurance Act, as set out in section 74 of the bill, be amended by striking out "rules, procedures, factors" in the first and second lines.

Section 82:

That subsection 52(4) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

(4) Section 1 of the said act is amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

(2) An electric streetcar that runs on rails principally on a highway shall be deemed to be a motor vehicle for the purposes of this act.

(3) Notwithstanding that a motor vehicle is insured under a contract of automobile insurance, it shall be deemed to be an uninsured motor vehicle for the purposes of this act while it is being operated by an excluded driver as defined in the Insurance Act with respect to that contract unless the excluded driver is a named insured under another contract of automobile insurance.

Section 86:

That subsection 4b(2) of the Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, as set out in subsection 86(2) of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

(2) If a person has recourse against the fund under section 232 of the Insurance Act, (a) a reference to an insurer in the no-fault benefits schedule shall be deemed to be a reference to the fund and a reference to an insured person shall be deemed to be a reference to the person who has recourse against the fund; and (b) sections 238, 239a and 242a to 242i of the Insurance Act apply with necessary modifications.

(3) The minister shall make payment out of the fund of the amounts owing to a person described in subsection (2).

(4) Subsection 21(9) does not apply to payments under this section.

Section 91:

That section 91 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

91.—(1) The filings made by an insurer with the Ontario Automobile Insurance Board under Ontario regulations 697/89, 110/90 and 111/90 shall together be deemed to constitute the insurer's first application under section 369 of the Insurance Act, as re-enacted by this act.

(2) An application referred to in subsection (1) shall be deemed to have been made on the date that section 74 comes into force.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS
(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Samia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaître, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling
Clerk: Douglas Amott**Estimates**

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Harold Brown**Finance and economic affairs**

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft
Clerk: Lisa Freedman**General government**

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman
Clerk: Franco Carrozza**Government agencies**

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South
Clerk: Harold Brown**Legislative Assembly**

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan
Clerk: Deborah Deller**Ombudsman**

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock
Clerk: Franco Carrozza**Public accounts**

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Regulations and private bills**

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham
Clerk: Lisa Freedman**Resources development**

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman
Clerk: Lynn Mellor**Social development**

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner
Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts
Clerk: Deborah Deller**Education**

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Energy**

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray
Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Wednesday 16 May 1990

Members' statements

Workers' compensation	1241
Miss Martel	
WCB publicity campaign	1241
Mrs Marland	
Easter Seals campaign	1241
Mr Ballinger	
Waste reduction	1241
Mr Morin-Strom	
Shelters for women	1242
Mr McLean	
Police use of firearms	1242
Mr Curling	
Biomedical waste disposal	1242
Mrs Grier	
Capital funding for schools	1242
Mr Jackson	
Food banks	1242
Mr Daigeler	

Oral questions

Police legislation	1243
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Offer	
Occupational health and safety	1244
Mr Mackenzie	
Mr Phillips	
Police legislation	1244
Mr Eves	
Mr Peterson	
Children's mental health services	1245
Mrs Cunningham	
Mr Beer	
Community colleges	1245
Mr Daigeler	
Mr Conway	
Employment equity	1246
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Wong	
Nursing education	1246
Mr Jackson	
Mr Conway	
Police commission nomination	1247
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Scott	
Mr Runciman	
Rental housing protection	1249
Mr Faubert	
Mr Sweeney	

Hospital financing	1249
Mr Farnan	
Mrs Caplan	
Police commission nomination	1250
Mr Runciman	
Mr Peterson	
Rent review	1250
Ms Poole	
Mr Sweeney	
Air quality legislation	1250
Mrs Grier	
Mr Bradley	

Committee of the whole House

Insurance Statute Law Amendment Act,	
1990, Bill 68	1251
Mr Kormos	1251
Mr Ferraro	1252
Mr Runciman	1255
Mr Charlton	1257
Mr J. M. Johnson	1258
Mr Philip	1261
Mrs Marland	1264
Mr Pouliot	1266
Reported	1272

Motion

Standing committee on administration of justice . . .	1272
The Speaker	
Agreed to	1272

Other business

Visitor	1243
The Speaker	
Business of the House	1272
Mr Ward	
Adjournment	1272

Appendix

Amendments to Bill 68 deemed to have been moved . .	1273
--	------

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1277
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1280



35 90

35 90

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 17 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 17 mai 1990



Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 17 May 1990

The House met at 1100.

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Allen moved second reading of Bill 165, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act.

Mr Allen: This morning we are addressing what by all accounts has to be one of the major crises afflicting Ontario and virtually every municipality within it. I want to state at the outset that I will be initiating the discussion of this bill and my colleague, our distinguished critic on environmental matters, the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, will be following through with the second portion of the discussion as we get into the second round.

The problem is certainly one of enormous proportions. As I say, there is hardly a municipality that is not afflicted with a major crisis of disposable waste. As Canadians, we produce 1.8 kilograms of solid waste per day. If one looks at that in cumulative terms, in the hour that we are addressing this bill in this Legislature, there will be in Ontario 1,140 more tonnes of garbage municipally added to the crisis and to the challenge.

I presume that, since we are the heaviest energy users in North America and in the world, we are also probably, by the same scale, industrially, municipally and personally on a per capita basis the equal of the Americans, at least in the production annually of garbage. If one takes all the emissions into the atmosphere, into the rivers and waters, into the soils, and handled through our municipal waste systems and so on totally on a global scale, it is estimated that each American produces 60,000 pounds of garbage per year, or 20 tonnes per person. At 9.5 million Ontarians, that runs to 190 million tonnes of waste per year. Municipally, we produce 10 million tonnes of waste per year.

This bill of mine would love to address the total problem. However, what it does address are the specifics of a municipal problem in the order of 10 million tonnes of garbage per year.

Given the scale of the problem, it is astonishing that the government appears to be committed principally to a voluntary approach to this question. Yes, there are a few regulations, but it is surprising how few they are and how limited they are in their impact and extent.

It is astonishing that, when my colleague the environmental critic for our party in December introduced a resolution to this House to sample the opinion of the Legislature on this question and proposed a series of recommendations, the response of the minister essentially was, "There go the New Democrats again wanting to regulate everybody."

I have to submit to you, Mr Speaker, that the regulatory regimes that exist are so feeble at this point in time and the dynamos that produce consumption and produce the enormous amounts of packaging to make consumption more attractive are so overwhelming that it is inconceivable to think that a policy that relies principally upon voluntarism would ever work.

For example, broadly speaking, municipalities still function under a regime in which they may dispose of what they want, where they want and when they want with remarkably few restrictions. Private waste disposal companies have so few controls on them that the minister does not even know in any detail what it is they dispose of or the overall total quantities.

The government itself has no mechanism for even understanding the scale in detail of the waste stream, as it is called, that flows from each one of us, from every industrial corporation, from every office operation and from every sector of our economy.

In the light of all that, the minister's playing down or making light of proposals of regulation is cavalier, to say the least, and irresponsible, to say what is perhaps more appropriate. We only have to look around us to see how the engines of consumption drive us on into greater and greater individual consumption.

It is calculated that, even with the blue box program operating at its greatest effect as a voluntary domestic method of getting some reduction and certainly some recycling of some elements of the waste stream, the actual pace of consumption is such and growing at such a pace that the total of consumption and packaging and product disposal will overtake the effects of the blue box program and we will be no further ahead in problems of disposability or of waste management at the end of this decade.

1110

This bill that I am producing is based on a rejection of certain propositions and an assertion of certain others. It rejects the proposition, for example, that waste management is essentially a local responsibility. At the moment, that is where most of the action lies. Municipalities have historically disposed of garbage. They understand that that has been their responsibility, and some of them are moving into recycling regimes and what have you.

But at the same time they have none of the jurisdictional or legislative powers to cope with the scale of the problem when one begins to address it in its real character, namely, the need to reduce the production of waste at its source or to embark upon major reusing initiatives, let alone to massively entertain recycling. Those regulations have to be provincial and federal, and each of these senior governments has a specific role in that regard and should be exercising it.

The second proposal that this legislation rejects is the proposition that all we have to do is work together to improve disposal methods. Disposability and incineration are the standard forms of disposal at this point in time in waste management. We reject them. There will always be some element of that in waste management, but overwhelmingly we have to address the problems of reducing waste at its source and then reusing where possible and recycling where necessary.

In this bill we also reject the principle that all individuals and corporations are free to produce and package materials without having regard to their ultimate fate. The producer of the problem in the first instance must be made responsible for its ultimate fate in terms of disposability and bear those costs. Those costs must not be loaded on to the environment, on to the municipality, on to the provincial government and on to the

taxpayer's back. There have to be taxation schemes, penalties, tax incentives and rebate mechanisms for dealing with that problem.

In terms of positive proposals, this bill endorses the proposal that reduction of waste at source is the first priority, to be followed by reuse and recycle. Second, waste options should minimize environmental impacts. We should not use one technique of reduction, reuse or recycling that will generate another problem in its wake. When there is an alternative product available, a disposable or non-recyclable product should not be permitted in the market.

We also propose that this whole process has to be institutionalized in order to make it function. I read from a major study done by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto on this subject:

"Reduction options will be resilient only if responsibility for development, implementation, monitoring and enforcement is given to an institution with the mandate and resources to sustain commitments to waste reduction. Their longevity can also be assured by giving them legislative or regulatory expression which can offer some insulation from the political exigencies of the day."

Wiser words were never spoken. One has to have in place structures that can deal on a systematic and ongoing basis with the problem of reduction at source, which means tackling the questions of the durability of products, the way in which they are produced and the incidental impact on the environment of production methods, the ways in which they are packaged and the forms, whether that packaging is recyclable or not, whether there are alternative methods of using, for example, containers that enable one to reuse and reuse the container in question and so on.

Those are the essential principles and those are the guidelines that lie behind the proposals that are in this piece of legislation. I will sit and await with interest the comments of the members in this House.

The Speaker: The following time will be divided among all parties, 15 minutes each, and then there will be two minutes for the sponsor to wind up.

Mr Jackson: It is my pleasure to rise in support of this private member's bill, Bill 165, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. I am always pleased to commend my colleague the member for Hamilton West for his initiative and his leadership in this regard. As we all know, matters affecting our environment are very much a non-partisan issue and very much an issue worthy of support.

I am delighted to inform the House that today in the Legislature in the visitors' gallery we have students from Aldershot High School in Burlington to bear witness to today's debate. They are the proud inheritors of a struggle within our own community to have the Aldershot landfill site redesignated so that that waste disposal site was not supported and they succeeded in the fact that its proximity to Lake Ontario was rejected.

Certainly the students at Aldershot High School were an integral part of the public awareness and the appeals before the Ontario Municipal Board and the joint commission in terms of having that site changed. So we are delighted to welcome them here today to the Legislature and we are very proud that they are here.

Crisis is a term that most often applies to the issues of waste and waste management in Ontario today. Provincial landfill sites serving half the population of Ontario will run out of

capacity, it is predicted, in the next 10 years, which is a very short time. To make matters worse, garbage production rates are on the increase. Each year Canadians produce an average of more than a tonne of garbage, both residential and industrial, which is double that produced just 25 years ago.

In Metro Toronto over the past four years alone, the works department has registered an annual increase in waste volumes of more than 15% while other large urban centres report similar trends. Environmental pressures forced the closing in 1988 of Toronto's aging incinerator and the abandonment of a new landfill. The process of searching for another landfill will take a minimum of five years to complete, which puts its resolution of this crisis to the year 1994. While Metro's two landfills are scheduled to be closed in 1990 and 1992, over 160 existing landfill sites through Ontario will reach capacity within the next two years and more than 300 will be filled up within five years.

In the case of Halton region, which I have the privilege of representing here in the Legislature, the site selection process has been going on for 15 years. It has cost our taxpayers in Halton over \$30 million, and we still have not found and completed our site. This includes \$80,000 a month which is spent to export our garbage to New York state, and we are still being bogged down in the process of appeals as we speak.

This is the crisis. An increasing volume of waste, rapidly decreasing capacity in existing waste management facilities and new facilities not coming on stream fast enough are formidable barriers to speeding up the process and the resolution of this crisis. We ask ourselves how this crisis could have arisen in the first place. The answer lies in its root cause, namely, our social attitudes, our throwaway lifestyle which is mostly to blame here.

Waste is something we no longer want or something we no longer have a use for. We ourselves therefore define what is waste and what is not. In the last 30 years, Canadians not only began consuming more resources per capita but also began substituting goods: plastics for woods, detergents for soap, synthetics for natural fibres, and so on. These trends created new kinds of waste that were far more difficult to dispose of and developed wasteful attitudes and behaviours that endure until today. Fully half of all garbage by volume consists of packaging, which consumers have come to expect.

Slowly an awareness of a contradiction is finding its way to the surface. Economic growth in the form it now takes and human lifestyle patterns exceed the capacity of the natural environment to assimilate the waste they generate. Environment ministries can no longer contain it. Our lifestyle depends on many kinds of goods being disposable, on consumer wasting rather than conserving and on getting rid of the waste.

Therefore, Mr Speaker, I can only suggest to you that given this crisis, given our understanding of the problems, we can do nothing more at this point than support the member for Hamilton West. He has put considerable time, as both his caucus and our caucus have, into addressing this issue. I would like to commend the city council of Burlington which has passed, as many councils in Ontario have, resolutions which speak directly to reducing the amount of packaging.

We want to suggest to the Minister of the Environment as well that the processes which are leading to the landfill selection have to be more streamlined and there has to be more effort on the part of the government in terms of reducing the amount of garbage and disposables that are going into our landfill sites.

I want to thank the member for his bill and pledge to him the continuing and ongoing support of the Conservative caucus and the members towards the resolution of his Bill 165.

1120

Mr Adams: The motion of the member for Hamilton West and his private member's bill address the place of reduction in waste management. I think the member, and certainly the member for Burlington South in what he said, and probably everyone who speaks this morning is very interested in a problem which is now facing us all, and that is whether the current interest in the environment, this enormous interest in environmental matters, is going to last, whether in fact there is going to be a change in our society which is going to be permanent and which is going to effect permanent changes in the way we operate as individuals and in the way that businesses, industry and governments operate.

Of course, if these changes do not become permanent—do not become institutionalized, I believe is the expression one of the previous speakers used—then all that we are doing now will be for nothing. There has to be a real change.

Part of that change, I think perhaps the most important part, is a change of attitude or a change in lifestyle. I think if this change is to come about, it has to come about in an informed populace. It cannot come about simply despite ignorance in the population in general or among legislators or business people or whatever. People have to know why they should change their lifestyles and their attitudes. I think only then will the change be permanent.

I think one of the contributions of this Ministry of the Environment, and in particular of the current Minister of the Environment, towards this change in attitude has been a raising of awareness of the meaning of the expression "the three Rs."

A very short time ago, it seems to me, if you went into a school and said, "What are the three Rs?" almost everyone would have said, "Oh, it's reading, writing and arithmetic." And if you had come into this House and you had said, "What are three Rs?" people would have said, "Reading, writing and rhetoric." But today, if you go into a school or you go into the street and you say to someone, "What are the three Rs?" they say immediately and with no hesitation at all, "The three Rs are reduce, reuse and recycle."

People are thinking about those three Rs and the Ministry of the Environment can take some credit for that, and I think it is important. As the member's private bill indicates, thought is already being given not only in this Legislature by the member for Hamilton West but also in the schools to those words, "reduce, reuse and recycle."

As the member has pointed out and as we all know, there is a certain logic to them. In the ideal world, first, you reduce unnecessary consumption as much as possible. Then, ideally, if you do use something, you reuse it and you reuse it again. Then and only then, in the ideal world, do you recycle. You take that product—let's say it is a bottle—you make it back into glass and you make it into another glass, consumable item. That is very important. Again, that order, that logic is known now among the general public and particularly I think among students, including those here in the gallery.

That logic is real, but we live in a world which, in some ways sadly and in some ways happily, is not an ideal world, and I am sure that the member, in putting forward this bill which stresses reduction, does not want us to give up in the area of recycling, give up in the area of reuse. He knows that we, all of us, have to somehow keep all three of these things going, even though in the very ideal case we would perhaps reduce first.

This, of course, is what the government has been striving to do, and it is not easy. It would be much simpler if we could reduce the thing to a formula and say, "Look, this year, next

year and the year after we will reduce, the years after that we will reuse, the years after that we will recycle." We have to somehow keep all of the three Rs going at once.

Let's look at some of the government's achievements in the area of the three Rs. The blue box has already been mentioned this morning. I believe it was a week Friday that the two-millionth household received its blue box in Ontario, and the number is growing daily. The blue box alone is now diverting over 250,000 tonnes of waste from the waste stream to some productive use, and each month more materials are being collected through the blue box in different parts of the province. The blue box is the most obvious phase of our recycling effort, one of the three Rs. It is the collection phase, and it is a very important phase because, through it, each household each day or each week makes a commitment to recycling by putting out its own blue box.

But the other phases are equally important. There has to be a technology phase for each of the materials; that is to say, a way of taking those materials and recycling them into a useful product. For example, in terms of newsprint, there has to be a way of safely bleaching the newsprint, and the government has been thinking of and working on that.

Once we have new materials, there has to be a marketing phase, and there has to be a way of selling the recycled products. If not, we end up with mountains of recycled material. Again, that is being addressed very seriously by the Ministry of the Environment. As members know, the major newspapers in the province are on side at last, and when the Sun, the Star, the Globe and Mail and so on place their next orders for newsprint, they will require recycled content. That is one example of the government's encouraging and stimulating the market phase of recycling, and if we have a collecting phase—the blue box—a technology phase for each material, a way of reprocessing the material and then a marketing phase, a way to sell those products, we have sustainable recycling.

If recycling is to stick, it has to be sustainable in that way, and the government has to keep all those aspects of recycling going. The goals of our activity in the three Rs are 25% diversion from landfill by 1992 and 50% diversion by the year 2000. This is exactly the same target as the member for Hamilton West has in his private member's bill.

In terms of reduction, the packaging standards developed by the province have been submitted and received by all the ministers of environment in Canada and will become the national standards, and I was pleased to see a number of the items in the member's bill echoing this government's proposed standards for packaging. Packaging certainly has to be one of the targets of any three Rs program.

I could mention, similarly, the government's efforts in the area of composting. I know composting is both recycling and reduction, as the member for Hamilton West realizes, but composting does reduce the volume of waste as well as creating a useful material. The Ministry of the Environment has assisted dozens of municipalities with home composting. In my own riding of Peterborough, every township now sells for between \$12 and \$25 a large home composter which citizens can use. By the way, these are being bought very rapidly and people are going into home composting.

The ministry is also supporting municipal, large-scale composting, and I look forward to the day when the pilot project which is now going on in Guelph will be used as a model for the whole province and when Peterborough will be into large-scale communal composting.

I intend to vote in favour of this private member's bill. I will leave the time that we have remaining for my colleague the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, who will be discussing other examples of the government's efforts in the area of reduction and the three Rs.

1130

Mrs Grier: I am very pleased to have the opportunity to have this debate in the House today and of course to support the bill that has been brought forward by the member for Hamilton West. As the member has said, this bill moves to implement the resolution that I put before this House last December and which called on the government to introduce before March 1990 some guidelines, some targets, some plans by which it would achieve the targets of waste reduction which it had announced and which the member for Peterborough reiterates today that it supports and which we all support.

The difference that we have with the member for Peterborough and with the members of this government is that we do not think those targets can be reached by voluntary effort. I find it really disappointing to hear the member for Peterborough explain how he sees the three Rs working, that he says it would be nice if for a period we could say, "We will for this length of time reduce and then we will reuse and then we will recycle." The three Rs are not in sequence, they are a hierarchy of importance, and the first importance is to reduce waste.

If you cannot reduce waste, then you recycle items, but you do not wait until you have decided whether or not you can reduce before you get into reusing and recycling. You have to look at every item in the waste stream and say: "How can that item be reduced? Can we stop using that? Can we somehow avoid having that particular product, that particular item, in the waste stream?" If we cannot do that, then, "Can we find a way of reusing it?" and only if we cannot reuse it, "Can we find a way of recycling it?" We do not wait until we have looked at every item in the waste stream before we look as to whether or not we can reduce them before we begin to look at how we can reuse them. We have to always keep in mind with every single item that is disposed of, could this be reduced; could this be reused; if it cannot, could it be recycled?

Our problem with the approach of the government is that it is focusing completely on recycling, and that, in itself, is not enough. By focusing on reduction, we are not saying we do not support recycling; we merely regard it as the last way to go, and only to go that way if we cannot approach the issue from the perspective of reduction and reuse.

When I put my motion before this House last December it was supported on all sides, but nothing has happened from the government since then. There have been no initiatives to implement that resolution, which it said it supported in principle. In fact, when we look at the actions that it has taken, they have been steps backward in reducing the requirement for refillable containers on the market. So in the absence of any action from this government, my colleague the member for Hamilton West has brought forward Bill 165, because what that bill will do is put in place the kinds of programs that would allow us to reach the target of 25% diversion of waste by the year 1992.

The reversal of this government's policies with respect to refillable containers was, I think, a very clear indication of its abdication of responsibility for showing leadership in the field of waste reduction. People have said all across the province that they want to do something about our environmental crisis. They want to participate in trying to solve the problems and they

have shown by their actions in using the blue box system how willing they are to do that.

The pop containers ought not to be in the blue box system. The blue boxes should be only for those things, as I have said, that you cannot reduce or reuse, and you can reuse pop containers. It is very basic; it is very simple. Every child who buys pop knows that if he buys it in a bottle for which there is a deposit, he will probably take that bottle back and that bottle will be reused. Why can this government not understand that this is what has to happen? If the government cannot understand that this has to happen with pop containers, we on this side have no hope that it will begin to understand that this has to happen with a whole lot of other items that now have ended up in the waste stream.

When I raised in the House the cave-in of the government to the soft drink industry by the reduction of the targets for refillable containers and the decision to no longer prosecute soft drink companies that do not meet the regulations, the Minister of the Environment accused me of not supporting the blue box system. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am very glad that two million people across the province are participating in the blue box system.

Mr Adams: Two million households.

Mrs Grier: The member for Peterborough corrects me and he is right.

My problem is that it too is a voluntary program. It is only available, by and large, to single-family households. It is only available in municipalities that choose to participate in it. It does not cover the commercial sector. It does not, by and large, cover multifamily units, apartment buildings and the like. It can only go so far.

Think how much further we could go in reducing garbage if we were prepared to say, "It is mandatory that you have blue boxes everywhere." But the government does not want to do that. It does not want to pass that kind of regulation.

Think how much further we could go if we said, "It is mandatory that you not landfill or dispose of items for which there could be another use," but this government does not want to do that. It does not want to interfere with the market. It does not want to regulate. It is prepared to put all the onus and all the responsibility on individuals.

We find, in fact, that many municipalities that entered with enthusiasm into the blue box program are now finding that it perhaps is not as great as it is cracked up to be and that it is going to be costing them a lot more money than they had originally envisaged. What municipalities are concerned about, given the record of this government, is that they are going to be left holding the bag for a blue box system that no longer pays its way because the government has done nothing to create the markets or to create the regulations that require people to reuse materials.

Let me quote from some comments that were made in the region of Durham, one of the first municipalities to get into recycling and to look at reducing garbage because of the problems it has with landfill. "The blue box recycling program," said representatives of Durham region, "has become a financial monster that eats up 10 times as much revenue as it generates and may eventually bankrupt some Ontario municipalities."

This government is putting all its emphasis on recycling in the blue box system. What action does it plan to take if in fact municipalities say that they can no longer participate?

From the North Bay Nugget, on 1 May 1990, "North Bay city council may have to rethink its planned blue box recycling program because of problems finding a market for recycled items." As one of the councillors said, "Our frustration is that municipalities spend a lot of money sorting and collecting recyclable products, and the province and the federal government have not moved fast enough to restrict certain kinds of packaging." I think that says it all.

This government has done nothing to reduce packaging, one of the major contributors to the garbage problem. Sure, they support the packaging protocol that came from the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers last March, but I want to remind the members, and particularly the member for Peterborough, who referred to that packaging protocol, that one of the targets in the protocol is that all provinces must have in place a nationally co-ordinated data collection program to make possible the monitoring of the targets by 31 December 1990.

We are now well into May 1990 and we have seen no indication from this government that it has in place a co-ordinated data collection program to make possible the monitoring of the targets for reduction of packaging that this government says it supports.

1140

I think it is worth reminding the members of what the packaging protocol says. It says that all packaging should have minimal effects on the environment. It says that priority will be given to the management of packaging through source reduction, reuse and recycling. It says there will be a continuing campaign of information and education to make Canadians aware of the function and environmental impacts of packaging. It calls for policies to apply to all packaging used in Canada, including imports. It calls for regulations to be implemented as necessary to achieve compliance with these policies.

This government has signed a national packaging protocol which calls for regulations, yet it consistently refuses to put in place in this province regulations that will help the people of this province meet those targets and reduce the packaging that is filling up our landfills all across the province. Every family in Canada produces one tonne of packaging per year and 80% of that packaging is disposed of. It is not reduced, reused or recycled, and we have no indication from this government that it is prepared to do that.

There is amazing public support for action to reduce garbage. There is amazing public support for the kinds of policies that are contained in Bill 165. There is amazing public support for some leadership from this government in moving proactively and aggressively to do its part to reduce garbage in the province. People want to do their part, but they cannot do it alone. By putting all the onus and all the responsibility on individuals, by relying entirely on a voluntary program, by saying that recycling is the first priority, this government is abdicating its responsibilities. Until they get serious and until they put in place some regulations that will assist people who want to help to do their part, we are not going to move meaningfully to reduce the garbage that is generated in this province.

I am very pleased that our party is showing that leadership, is providing constructive suggestions in the vacuum that exists on the other side, and I am pleased to have the support of private members. I hope that will soon be translated into support by the minister and by the cabinet.

Mr J. M. Johnson: I would like to start by thanking the member for Hamilton West for bringing forth Bill 165 and ex-

press my support. I support all aspects of the bill, but in the short time I have to speak I would like to concentrate on clause 1(1a)(a), "establishing programs to assist municipalities, to achieve...a 50% reduction in the amount of waste being deposited at waste disposal sites."

I would like to concentrate on a problem in my riding. The county of Wellington has been trying to establish a dump or a landfill site, whatever you want to call it, for the past few years. They have spent over \$1 million and they are not much closer today than they were two years ago. The rural people just do not want the city's garbage and they are sick of being forced to accept it.

One problem that we have is used tires. It is my understanding that seven million used tires are placed in landfill sites every single year. I think it works out to something like 11 tires being discarded each minute. In making reference to the problem with tires, I would refer to the Hagersville tire fire a few months ago. There is a front-page story in the Toronto Star today, "Tire Dump Ablaze in Quebec," which states, "Millions of flaming tires were turned into a 'monstrous furnace' as they burned out of control at Quebec's largest tire dump last night." It goes on to say, "It's just like the Hagersville fire."

How long must we wait for the government to take action? How many more fires? In the few minutes, I would just like to emphasize that we should be dealing with the problem of discarded tires and what to do with them. The traditional disposal method of landfilling is not adequate as the tires eventually float to the top. In addition, landfill space is at a premium and very little more is going to be available in the future.

In Europe and the United States tires are used as fuel replacement for cement kilns. That is what I would like to propose, that the government give consideration to using tires in a controlled test burn and allow St Marys and other tire companies that have promoted this for several years the opportunity to prove they are environmentally safe. If they are not environmentally safe, then forget about it. But if they are environmentally safe, they will replace some of the coal that is being burned at the present time, which is imported into the country. They will help to get rid of the surplus tires; it is my understanding that they can use 1.5 million tires per year.

It is a technology that has been in existence in Europe: Germany, Sweden, several of the European countries have used it. It was designed in Canada, I think about 15 years ago, by St Lawrence Cement. They call it the "Canadian technology," but we do not use it in Canada. There is possibly a reason that we should not use it, and it may prove that would be the result of a test, but surely anyone should be agreeable to trying out an experiment with it; have a controlled test and see how it works.

In Germany, when they first introduced it, it took approximately a year's test for every site that they burned tires at, and every single one proved successful and is in operation now. So the technology is available. It apparently is safe or it would not be used in these countries; many of them are as environmentally concerned as we are. So I suggest that it is time that the minister took a look at the issue and tried to deal with it, with one aspect, as I mentioned, of the tire problem.

As the member for Hamilton West has brought forward, there are many other issues that are dealt with in the bill. I support the whole concept of the bill and I hope that the government would give consideration to doing something about the used tires, unless we want to continue to read in the press every two or three months of another tire deposit site that goes up in flames.

Mr Faubert: It is my privilege today to rise in support of Bill 165, which has been brought forward by the member for Hamilton West. On 10 March 1989, the Ministry of the Environment announced that Ontario would divert to constructive purposes 25 per cent of its household and commercial and industrial waste in 1992 and 50 per cent by the year 2000. That is the objective of the Ministry of the Environment. Let me take the opportunity today to describe initiatives supported by this government to help achieve the goal. I would point out that this, indeed, is leading by example.

On 10 October last, the Minister of Government Services and the Minister of the Environment announced the \$1.6-million first phase of a comprehensive program to apply the three Rs—reduce, reuse and recycle—to the Ontario government workplace. I agree with the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore that this is a hierarchy of priorities and I think the emphasis should be on reduction.

The government's goal is to divert more than 3,000 tons of waste per year away from landfill and incineration, and we are now in the process of implementing that program. This government is the first provincial government in Canada to undertake a comprehensive internal waste management program. We hope to serve as an example for other provinces, and indeed for the private sector, to follow.

The primary focus in the first phase is on the recycling of fine paper, newspaper, glass and plastic bottles, and metal cans. The program is currently being implemented in Queen's Park and also within this Legislature, and it will soon be expanded to cover 45,000 Ontario public servants in more than 120 buildings across Metropolitan Toronto. We plan to expand this program across the province to cover all government buildings in communities which have a blue box program presently in operation.

Perhaps one simple but effective way that will work to reduce waste is by doublesided photocopying. We estimate the government will save 29 tonnes of photocopy paper simply by replacing all of the high-volume copiers with machines that copy on both sides. That is bad news for Xerox paper suppliers but it is good news for the environment. This is an effective reduction of a product use.

1150

Perhaps the biggest environmental problem our society faces is that many products we use have been designed to be used once and be thrown away. The increased awareness of the need to protect our waste diversion programs provides funding and technical assistance to industrial, commercial and institutional sectors to encourage recycling activities. These activities include the recycling of a wide range of materials, such as plastics, corrugated cardboard, wood wastes, paints and solvents, liquid industrial wastes and other hazardous wastes. To date, over 150 projects have been approved for funding. This program had a budget of \$6.5 million in the 1989-90 fiscal year and has been in place since June 1987.

I would like to point out to the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore that perhaps among the government members themselves there is a great deal of support for the position brought forward by this private member's bill. We have not gone far enough—we will admit that—in this area to encourage recycled products and markets or to encourage the source reduction, but I would like to point out that I too, like my colleague the member for Peterborough, intend to vote in support of Bill 165.

Mr Pollock: I want to compliment the member for Hamilton West for bringing forth this bill and I certainly am going to

support it. I am going to support it maybe with a little reluctance on one particular issue.

He mentioned in his bill, Bill 165, that he hoped to see a reduction of the garbage going into landfill sites by the year 2000. I have a reeve in my municipality who has actually stated that they have reduced garbage going into a landfill site by 70 per cent right now, and by the year 2000 they ought to be able to do a bit better. I know the member is trying to set up a guideline for the whole province, and that is fine. As I say, I compliment him on bringing forth this bill and I am certainly going to support it.

I am not really a supporter of landfill sites. I firmly believe there is no proof that, over the next 50 or 100 years, landfill sites will not cause every bit as much of a problem to the environment as incinerating garbage. I have a clipping here from the Toronto Star, dated 14 May, and this newspaper clipping states that Metro Toronto has offered to buy the landfill site in Petrolia for \$30 million. I am a believer in the old cliché that you get what you pay for, or vice versa. If Metro is going to pay \$30 million for that particular landfill site, you can rest assured that Metro has every intention of dumping \$30-million worth of garbage into that landfill site.

One of the things that always concerns people in the rural areas is the polluting of their water systems. Some of these major landfill sites certainly do that. There is leachate coming out of these landfill sites and they are polluting the underground water system. One of the worst things is a battery. I know a little battery like this does not mean much, but if I were to break this battery and put it in that glass of water I am sure nobody here would offer to drink it; plus the fact that if I broke it and got a little of it on my suit, it would be "Goodbye, suit." That is what is going into our underground water supply, and it is of real concern to me.

I want to mention the fact that in my neighbouring municipality of Seymour there is a landfill site. It started up about six years ago. In two and a half years it has been leaching. Apparently they went into the county plan and now they have got to take Cobourg's garbage. That will just add to the problem, and apparently Cobourg has not got a waste management plan in place, nor has it got a blue box program in place. That is of real concern to the people from the Seymour area.

I would want to mention also that on 19 May—that is, this Saturday—they are having a walkathon in Marmora. I invite everybody in that whole area to come to that walkathon. This is being sponsored by TNT. It is actually promoting awareness of the proposed dumping of Metro's garbage in the old iron ore site at Marmora. They are starting their walk at the curling club. They are going from there out to the site. The people of Marmora and area are working hard to resist the dumping of garbage in there. Back in 1984, the Ministry of the Environment people wrote a report that stated that this was not a safe place to dump garbage. There is over two billion gallons of water in that particular mine site. It is fresh water, there are fish in there and I do not believe Metro should be dumping garbage in that particular site. I want to support and compliment TNT—TNT, I might say, stands for Take No Trash—on its efforts to oppose dumping Metro's garbage in that mine site.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): I note there is almost a minute left on the government side. I would suggest to the honourable member we will allow three minutes for his concluding remarks.

Mr Allen: I want to thank the members on all sides of the House for supporting Bill 165, legislation to move towards a

regulatory regime to deal with the reduction of solid municipal waste in Ontario.

I appreciate the support of the member for Wellington and I certainly concur with his central comment that there is no reason why rural municipalities should be forced to deal with the problem of urban garbage. The member for Hastings-Peterborough can take back our compliments to his reeve. Any reeve who can reduce what is going into landfill by 70% is accomplishing these objectives in advance and ought to go on tour across Ontario to help other people do the same thing.

Likewise, I want to thank the members of the government side who spoke, the member for Peterborough and the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere. I would only say to the very useful comments of the member for Peterborough that yes, indeed, it is very critical that a population understands the issue that we are grappling with and that government move in sync with an understanding and an intelligent population. I have no problem with that. I was a little concerned with his sense of what "reduce" means, in terms of the reduction of consumption by individuals. That is not the technical meaning that normally we give to it in this debate. The reduction of waste at source, in the productive process, in the packaging requirements and so on is what we refer to in that respect.

Certainly no one would deny that harnessing the voluntary interests and wills of individual people across Ontario, as they themselves have increasingly become sensitive to the environmental crisis, is a tremendous engine for changing the problems of waste disposal that we have at hand, indeed with respect to all environmental problems. But as the member himself did say, one does have to worry that perhaps that is a passing commitment, that perhaps it will not be an enduring, functioning motivation.

The purpose of public policy in general, I think, is to provide those means and mechanisms collectively whereby we can give force to our individual intentions, and to give them a structure, a direction, a meaning and a result that we all want. That is why I have proposed the sequence of proposals in this bill for dealing with the matter of waste reduction.

I hope that the member is an advance guard of his government in persuading it to move even more thoroughly and completely into a regulatory regime that can deal with this question, and to deal with it in the following terms, namely, to provide regulations, through the amendments to the Environmental Protection Act, which will:

- establish programs to assist municipalities to achieve the objective, by January 2000, of a 50% reduction in the amount of waste being deposited in waste disposal sites;

- establish reduction plans for the reduction of designated wastes within prescribed time periods;

- designate types of waste that shall be covered by waste reduction plans and prescribe time periods;

- designate materials that should be subject to source separation;

- govern the phasing out of the use of containers and packaging for which there are waste reduction alternatives;

- designate containers and packages that are required to be phased out and prescribe time periods for phasing out such containers and packaging;

- designate disposable products for which non-disposable substitutes are available and prohibit the use of such products;

- prescribe, for example, durability standards for consumer products so that they will not have to be disposed of at an early date in their life;

- govern the sale and distribution of consumer products that do not meet the prescribed durability standards;

- govern the reuse and recycling of containers and packaging; require manufacturers of designated products to use such proportion of recoverable materials as prescribed;

- prescribe the proportion of recoverable materials to be used in designated products;

- set out a regulatory regime that enables municipalities to respond at the level of reduction, reuse and recycling;

- authorize municipalities to refuse to collect waste for disposal if the waste has not been properly separated and to refuse to accept waste at disposal sites if waste can be reused and recycled.

In all those respects, it is necessary for this government to move in the direction of a regulatory regime but also in the direction of an information-collecting regime which will make all of that possible on a systematic and effective basis. In that respect, I hope that the support of all members in this House will help move the government in that direction.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 94(k), the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

Mr Allen: I propose that this bill be referred to the standing committee on resources development.

Hon Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, I propose that your first suggestion be carried forward.

The Acting Speaker: We have to determine if the majority is in favour of the bill going to the standing committee. It would appear that they are not and that they want to refer it to the committee of the whole House.

Mr Breagh: You have got to test and see.

The Acting Speaker: We've got to vote on it?

Mr Breagh: It's just Remo off by himself. Maybe the rest have seen the light.

The House divided on whether the bill should be referred to the standing committee on resources development, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes 10; nays 26.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

The House recessed at 1204.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The House resumed at 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Farnan: Right now there are over 10,000 children in Ontario on the waiting lists of the province's 85 children's mental health centres. Just last month, the Minister of Correctional Services admitted that 18% of the inmates in Ontario's correctional system have psychiatric mental health problems.

It is time this government got its priorities straight and realized that spending money on children's mental health, rather than on their future incarceration, is the only approach that makes sense.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services allocates \$116 million a year to the 85 centres, an average of \$3,400 per child. Compare this to the \$47,000 a year it costs to incarcerate an adult prisoner.

As a society we are abhorred by the waiting lists for cancer therapy and heart bypasses. Should our outrage not be even more vehement when we find children who are victims of sexual abuse, the witnesses of family violence, prone to deliberately injure themselves, depressed, violent and all without treatment? What price do we put on these children? We pay the dedicated professionals in the field so poorly and the pressure of their work is so great that burnout rates among front-line social workers are running at between 60 and 80 per cent.

It is often said that we judge a society by the manner in which it treats the weakest and the most vulnerable of its members. By this criterion, the plight of the 10,000 children on mental health services' waiting lists is an indictment of our society.

ZEBRA MUSSELS

Mr Pollock: With the holiday weekend approaching, I would like to bring the problem of zebra mussels to the attention of the public. The mussels have already caused problems in the Great Lakes. These problems include damaging spawning beds and clogging intake pipes and they have sunk navigation buoys, to mention just a few aspects of the multimillion-dollar problem.

People seem to feel helpless when it comes to stopping the zebra mussels; so please, when you are out this weekend, do not spread the zebra mussels to our inland lakes. Do not transport live bait or any type of container from our Great Lakes to other bodies of water. Do not take water from one lake to another. Scrape your boat hull and trailer clean when taking them from the Great Lakes. If the surface feels grainy, it is probably mussel larvae.

Mussels can survive a minimum of four days out of water and, if the humidity is high, even longer. Empty your bilge, ballast water and live well on land. Scuba divers should take extra care with their gear when moving from one lake to another.

Have a mussel-free holiday weekend.

THREE FOR A TREE PROGRAM

Mr Reycraft: A short time ago I reported to the assembly about an activity going on in my riding of Middlesex that is

truly a unique way of raising awareness and money for the environment. I would like to update members on the Three for a Tree campaign sponsored by the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, TV London and McDonald's.

The campaign encouraged people to help with reforestation by purchasing lapel pins, like the one I am wearing, for \$3 each. For every pin sold, enough money was raised to plant at least one tree. Like trees themselves, the idea was planted, it grew and it blossomed. Some 8,500 lapel pins were sold, raising enough money to plant more than 13,000 hardwood trees.

Armed with this success, the program will continue to sell more pins, raise more money and plant more trees. Distribution of the pins has been expanded beyond McDonald's. For example, students from Strathroy District Collegiate Institute sold the pins to mark Earth Day. It is that type of community involvement that makes this project so fulfilling and so worth while.

The Middlesex-London area has a reputation for its beautiful trees, parks and forests. I am proud of the people who took the initiative to enhance this reputation and of all the people who bought pins to support this campaign. I am sure all members of the assembly join me in applauding the Three for a Tree program and wishing its organizers continued success.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT

Mr Kormos: Welland-Thorold, sadly, is as much in need of treatment beds for victims of alcohol and drug abuse as any other area in the province of Ontario. In fact, we have been fortunate to have programs like Homes for Reflection in Welland, which for the last five years was operated under the very skilful and competent leadership of Irene Bissonnette, and for the last year equally skilfully by Pauline Raby. This is a program that provides drug and alcohol treatment for women on an in-house basis over a 28-day period. It has been outstandingly successful and has serviced not only women from the Niagara region, but women from all other parts of Ontario and indeed other parts of the country.

Sadly, this government and this Ministry of Health have deemed that the 10 beds operating at Homes for Reflection will now be reduced to six, not that the demand is not there; there are waiting lists lengthier than any of us would ever wish.

Simultaneously with that, this government lets scavengers like Phoenix operate. Phoenix is a so-called alcohol and drug consultant service that scavenges the streets of Toronto and Ontario looking for patients for a New Orleans-based hospital and drug and alcohol treatment program. Why will this government and this ministry not invest money in their own treatment programs right here in the province of Ontario instead of the United States of America?

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr Runciman: Later this afternoon, the Chair of the standing committee on general government will be presenting a report regarding events that took place this morning in committee. Mr Speaker, I have some very serious concerns about this report and will be raising them with you on a point of order after the report is tabled.

Last week, under standing order 123, I requested that the subcommittee of the general government committee designate 12 hours to consider a matter that involved the Ministry of

Municipal Affairs and the Premier's office. This motion was perfectly in order. However, this morning the member for Yorkview attempted to stall this motion, thereby stripping the opposition of its rights under standing order 123.

This is a travesty. It is one more attempt by the Peterson Liberal government to ride roughshod over the rights of the minority and to further diminish our parliamentary democracy. Mr Speaker, I would urge you to rule on this matter this afternoon before the committee reconvenes.

CONSUL GENERAL OF JAPAN

Mr D. W. Smith: On 10 May 1990 I had the pleasure of attending a reception in honour of Tadashi Masui, the consul general of Japan. The consul general was the honoured guest of the Economic Development Commission and this reception was held at the close of his day-long visit to the Sarnia-Lambton area. The event was hosted by the Sarnia-Lambton Economic Development Commission and was held at the Polysar building in Sarnia. There were many business people and elected officials in attendance.

Mr Masui was invited to visit the Sarnia-Lambton area in an effort to provide an opportunity for community leaders to discuss potential investment and cultural opportunities between Japan and Sarnia-Lambton.

I am pleased to say Mr Masui received an enthusiastic welcome to the Sarnia-Lambton area. Upon completion of his tour of the region, he indicated that he was impressed with the greenness of Lambton, which I presume would be a contrast to his own country, and the beautiful blue-green St Clair River.

1340

During the reception in his honour, there was a great deal of discussion on promoting Canadian-Japanese business co-operation. He indicated his desire and his country's desire to become a good corporate friend of Lambton. Japan has invested a great deal in our country, and he hopes that this excellent business partnership can continue in the years to come.

The consul general as well as others who attended the reception were impressed to learn from local business people that approximately \$7 billion worth of products are sold by the petrochemical industry in the Sarnia-Lambton area each year.

I would like to say that it was a pleasure to have the consul general of Japan, Tadashi Masui, show an interest in visiting Lambton county and in discovering the many investment opportunities available in this area.

CAPITAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS

Miss Martel: On 23 April I advised this House of the long-standing capital needs of both the Sudbury Board of Education and the Sudbury District Roman Catholic Separate School Board. I encouraged this government to respond positively to the needs to demonstrate support for quality education in northern Ontario.

Capital grant allocations were announced on 4 May. A look at what happened in Sudbury proves the government did not listen to what I had to say. For example, the Sudbury board was advised it received \$930,000. The schedule, however, shows that this allocation is spread out over a three-year period, from 1991 to 1993. The actual allocation for 1991 is \$130,000, even though the amount previously approved for 1991 was \$305,000. Somewhere, \$175,000 has been reclaimed by the Ministry of Education, and no one is quite sure where it has gone.

The separate school board was allocated \$1.2 million to cover renovations at one school and to purchase the land for a

new secondary school. However, this allocation was not granted for 1991. The money is to be provided to the board in 1992, which means the new school, so desperately needed, has been put on hold yet again. I can only hope that the money promised will not be reduced by the ministry in future, as was the case with the public board this year.

A lot of fanfare accompanied these allocations, but when you get right down to it, there is not much substance behind the fluff.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Jackson: In light of the pending provincial election, I would like to remind the Liberal members that during the 1985 election campaign the leader of the Liberal Party promised to raise the provincial share of education funding to 60%. Despite the slogan "I did what I said I would do," this Premier has let the provincial share in each of the last five years. It now stands at a mere 40%.

Provincially mandated programs have been offloaded on to the property tax base, forcing boards to pass on double-digit mill rate increases. The Ontario Public School Boards' Association reports that property taxes went up by \$1 billion in 1989. They estimate that an additional \$800 million will have to be raised from property taxes this year.

Given that there is an election in the air, I would like to remind the Liberal backbenchers of the property tax increases their constituents face because of the Premier's education policy: Hamilton public and Hamilton-Wentworth separate boards, 18.1%; Lanark county, 17.5%; Durham board, 14.8%; Halton board, 14.6%; Essex county, 13.5%; Wentworth county, 12.5%; Lakehead district separate, 12.3%; Waterloo county, 12.1%; Brant county, 12%; Grey county, 10.7%, and Sault Ste Marie, 10.5%.

Mr Speaker, be assured that at every opportunity we will be reminding taxpayers of the real reason that their property taxes have gone through the roof this year.

KATHLEEN TAYLOR

Mr Adams: The Peterborough YWCA sponsored its 11th annual Woman of the Year Award on 10 May. This is an award to recognize, honour and celebrate achievements of women in Peterborough and area who have contributed to the advancement of women. Nominees for this prestigious award have enriched the lives of others, have acted as role models and have demonstrated commitment to the advancement of women.

This year's nominees, all distinguished citizens, were honoured at a dinner at which the award winner was announced. The nominees were Maureen Barrett Roe, Cathy Beach, Marsh Cobden, Fern Doyle, Gail Hancock, Lois Harte-Maxwell, Carola Lane and Kathleen Taylor.

This event is an important opportunity to honour women in the area served by our YWCA. The YW is a leader in providing opportunities for the development of women and children, as well as providing shelter for women and children fleeing family violence. The YW also provides a wide range of educational, social and recreational programs for women.

My riding is fortunate to have such an organization acting on behalf of women. Past women of the year have included Kim Naish, Marilyn Huels, Rosemary Ganley, Erika Cherney and Sharon Murphy. This year's winner was Kaye Taylor, who was recently admitted to the Order of Ontario, and about whom I spoke in this House on 8 May.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

EDUCATION IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Hon Mr Conway: The Contact North distance education network is an electronic success story.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Conway: For the edification of my friend the Leader of the Opposition, who would know that, since this pilot project began three years ago, in 1987, Contact North has provided a wide range of secondary and post-secondary educational opportunities to northern Ontarians, many of whom live in isolated communities.

Using innovative information technology, Contact North creates an electronic classroom that serves more than 75 northern communities and is available to more than 90% of all northerners. Students in different communities are linked to colleagues and teachers in other areas by means of telephone conferencing. Lessons are exchanged electronically by means of facsimile machines and by computer conferencing. The network even provides an electronic blackboard using computer screens and telephone lines.

Today I am pleased to announce that the government of Ontario will provide \$7.6 million to continue and to expand upon this vital initiative. No longer a pilot project, Contact North will build on its success and will expand into additional northern secondary schools.

Funding this year for Contact North and northern distance education will include up to \$4 million for the operation of the Contact North network and related services, up to \$1.5 million to help northern colleges and universities develop additional distance educational instructional material and \$2.1 million of one-time capital equipment funding from the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines to help northern secondary schools purchase equipment needed to participate in the network.

Contact North has proven to be an electronic highway allowing all northerners to participate more fully in this province's educational system.

I am pleased to report to this Legislature that 75% of Contact North students are female, 15% are francophone and 12% are aboriginal Canadians. In addition, 85% of the students are from outside the five main urban centres in northern Ontario.

To remain competitive in the emerging global economy, we must ensure that all Ontarians have equal access to a quality educational experience, and Contact North is a vital link in helping us meet that challenge.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF
OTTAWA-CARLETON

Hon Mr Sweeney: This afternoon, I intend to introduce legislation to give voters of Ottawa-Carleton a direct say in the running of their regional government. The legislation will, for the first time, allow voters in new regional wards to directly elect someone whose only job will be to represent their interests at regional council.

The regional chairman, who now is not directly accountable to voters, will be chosen by regional council from among its directly elected members.

Mayors of the 11 municipalities within the region will remain on regional council as representatives of their municipalities and to provide a link between the two levels of government.

The changes I am announcing today are the result of a long and thorough process of study and consultation, a process that

started nearly three years ago when the provincial government, at the request of the regional council, appointed former Rideau township mayor David Bartlett to review its system of regional government.

Something that became very clear during the consultation process is that the people of Ottawa-Carleton are concerned about the overall size of municipal government in their region. Very soon, I intend to appoint a commissioner, whose job will be to start a consultation process leading to the creation of between 14 and 18 new regional wards. But, part of the commissioner's job will be to ensure, by reducing the size of the existing area councils, that the total number of elected positions in Ottawa-Carleton will not increase as a result of this change.

The new regional wards will not necessarily follow municipal boundaries. In the interests of representation by population, some regional wards may cross municipal boundaries. This is entirely consistent with the idea that these new councillors will have a broader regional perspective. They will represent not the municipalities they come from, but the people who elect them.

I am introducing the legislation this spring so that this new structure can be in place in time for the 1991 municipal election year.

This change is an important step forward for the people of Ottawa-Carleton. Regional issues today are too important to be dealt with by councillors whose first responsibility is to their local lower-tier council. Now, for the first time, the people of Ottawa-Carleton will really know who is responsible for regional issues.

1350

RESPONSES

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF
OTTAWA-CARLETON

Mr Breaugh: I would like to respond briefly to the statement by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It is very true that in the Ottawa-Carleton region there has been an ongoing argument about the nature of regional government. We are pleased to see that the government has done something. I am not quite convinced what it has done here.

There is some form of quasi-democracy headed towards the Ottawa-Carleton region. It is somewhat ironic that in the nation's capital we cannot quite figure out the democratic process yet. There will be something close to an elected chairman of the region, but not quite. It will always be fascinating to watch that unfold.

I have read with interest the proposal that the minister is going to make in legislative form later on this afternoon about boundaries, that we will consult yet again and establish some new hybrid form of representation where they will cross municipal boundaries.

I wish the minister luck, but there is only one thing in his whole statement that I would like to challenge. That is the last line: "Now, for the first time, the people of Ottawa-Carleton will really know who is responsible for regional issues." I really doubt that a lot.

EDUCATION IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr R. F. Johnston: I would like to respond to the Minister of Colleges and Universities' announcement of the expansion of the Contact North distance education network. Everyone is quite pleased with the way that has operated.

One would want a very thorough evaluation to be undergone, and I am surprised that there is no major announcement of funds to do that kind of evaluation of the program and some of the problems and failings as well as successes that we have seen with that program. One of the problems often in provincial initiatives is that no evaluation component is built into funding, and it would be a wise thing for us to do.

Some of the figures that were announced are startling. That 75% of the students are women raises a number of questions. Some very positive responses can obviously be seen, but there are also some serious questions on the other side that should be asked in terms of male representation and need for some of the programs, which I participated in personally.

I must say, as I congratulate the minister on this, that I am surprised that again today he has come out with what is in the realm of things a small announcement, at the same time as he should have been coming out with a statement on education which is of much more significance. That is that today is the 120th day since the report of the select committee on education came down recommending major changes around financing of education in Ontario, and that report has not been tabled in this House.

The minister has not made a statement on that report in this House today, in spite of the fact that this province is suffering from enormous inequities in education, which are not just northern problems, but problems of real financing concerns. He should have been talking about what he is going to do about the fact that in Metropolitan Toronto, for instance, \$7,409 a student is being spent on the education of individuals at the secondary level, when in other parts of the province we are talking about \$5,600 being spent, a difference of virtually \$1,800 in the amount of money that one municipality can put into education versus another.

At the same time as we are saying that, even those municipalities with a lower level of expenditure are putting in over \$1,400 more than the provincial ceilings allow for. That is how out of touch our education system has become in terms of the financing realities. But today we do not get an announcement about that; we get an announcement about the northern network, a very small, little part of the overall program. To me, that is unthinkable.

I look at the figures, even from neighbouring Buffalo, and compare the fact that in 1987 they were spending much more money in Buffalo for education than we are spending here in Metro Toronto, the place where we are spending the most money on education.

Interjection.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Yes, I will give the member the statistics—I was thinking he would want them—US\$5,567 was spent in Buffalo on education, and in Metro Toronto it was C\$5,078. If we compare that with other regions in this province, we can see that the deficit is even more enormous than that. So we are not even keeping up with our neighbours to the south, who one would have thought are not as committed as we are in terms of education.

Why has the minister not come out with that response today? Why has he not taken that report as seriously as he should have when the questions of equity around financing of education and the incredible cost that property taxpayers are having to pay for education in this province have not been addressed by his government as they should have been? That would have been a much more welcome announcement today

and would have shown a little more respect for the select committee process than the response we have had from him.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

Mr Sterling: I would like to respond to the Minister of Municipal Affairs on the direct election of Ottawa-Carleton regional council. Dave Bartlett, who is the mayor of the township in which I reside and a man who I know and respect, I think has done an excellent job in trying to reach compromises, in trying to reach some meaningful reforms in both the reports that he has presented to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

There are a number of things which perhaps concern me about the process, and I have not had the opportunity to look at the legislation so I do not know all the details. But I understand from the minister's announcement and some of the brief discussions I have had with some of the politicians in the local area that the commissioner, whoever that should be—and Mr Bartlett himself might be a good consideration, because I think he achieved a degree of credibility with the politicians in the area—is given, according to the statement, considerable powers in what he will do under this act.

For instance, the commissioner will be deciding where the boundaries lie for these different elected positions. Not only that, but the commissioner will be making some decisions which are very near and dear to the hearts of many municipal politicians across the Ottawa-Carleton area regarding the composition and the form of their future municipal councils. We are not talking about regional councils at this time; we are talking about the municipal councils themselves.

I am not clear from the announcement, as I have not read the legislation, who will have the final say both in terms of boundaries and in terms of the size of the municipal councils. The minister is pointing to himself and saying, "I will have that say."

That leads me to my third and final point. I believe that legislation like this, which has more of an impact on the Ottawa-Carleton area, should be referred to a committee, and that committee should travel to the Ottawa-Carleton area. You know, Mr Speaker, that under our standing orders that can only be done during a period of time when the Legislature itself is not sitting.

I would, therefore, implore the minister to have this bill referred to a committee of the Legislature, and during the summer break we would be able to go to the Ottawa-Carleton area and have input from not only the local municipal politicians but also the people in the area as to his plans for the structure of the government.

That will essentially be the last time that a public forum will be available to the people before he, the minister, as appointed by himself today, will make the final decision on these very, very important matters.

Then I would anticipate that when we return, according to our calendar in the third week in September, we could consider this bill for third and final reading after the appropriate amendments had been made. I am assuming that the minister will see the sensitivity of this issue and the urgent need for this issue to be resolved before 1 November. That of course would work against this government calling a needless election in September of this year.

I look forward to the reforms and I think the people in the area look forward to the reforms, but proper consultation is an absolute necessity. I would urge the minister to take the response which I have indicated today as a serious response

with regard to the consultative necessity of having everybody in the Ottawa-Carleton area have their say in an open forum on this issue.

1400

EDUCATION IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr Eves: Very briefly, in response to the statement by the Minister of Colleges and Universities, we are pleased to see that this pilot project has now become a permanent fixture in his ministry, although it is basically just a regurgitation or reiteration of a 1987 election campaign promise. I do not know whether the minister is trying to give us a message over there or not.

On a more serious note, I am pleased to see that the Minister of Northern Development is also participating in this process.

COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr R. F. Johnston: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to raise a concern under standing order 36(d), which says: "Within 120 calendar days of the presentation of a committee report as provided in clauses (b) and (c), the government shall, upon the request of the committee, table a comprehensive response."

The Minister of Education has complied with this recommendation on our first two reports. So far today, he has not chosen to do so on the third report, on financing. I am quite concerned about this and would like to have the matter raised through you to the minister.

Hon Mr Conway: I want my honourable friend to know that it is my intention to respond very, very shortly. I do not believe the 120 days at this moment have been realized, but I can assure him that I will do everything I possibly can to meet his expectations in this and, of course, in all other respects.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Is this the 120th day? I am glad he went out to see his staff.

The Speaker: Order. The member tried to make a point of order, and if the 120 days are not up yet, maybe it is not a point of order.

Mr R. F. Johnston: It says "within 120 days."

The Speaker: Oh, "within." We are close to it then.

REPLICA FIREARMS

Mr Farnan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Today I requested permission to bring a selection of replica guns into question period, and both the Sergeant at Arms and yourself, as Speaker, ruled against my request.

My private member's bill, Bill 145, recommends that such guns be banned in Ontario. May I request the rationale for your decision not to allow these replica guns to be brought into the House today? After all, if these are just harmless toys, easily accessible across the province in toy and department stores at prices of \$3 to \$5, why would you be worried about their presence in the assembly?

I would suggest, Mr Speaker, that your decision speaks eloquently to the issue. If it is unsafe to have these weapons exposed in this House, surely we should provide the same safeguards across the province for children and for police officers.

The Speaker: I appreciate the member's point of order and, in a way, his suggestion that he does not agree with what

the Speaker and the Sergeant at Arms suggested. However, I am sure all members are aware that we have tried for quite a long time to discourage any props being brought into the chamber.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I appreciate the member's accepting the suggestion of the Speaker, but I would inform all members that quite a number of days ago, because of the activities and props used in this House, I wrote directly to the chairman of the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly asking him to reconsider a previous report.

ORAL QUESTIONS

RENT REVIEW

Mr B. Rae: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment, who is not here, but I hope he will be here. I also have a question for the Minister of Housing, and since he is here certainly in body, I will ask him a question.

My colleague the House leader, the member for Windsor-Riverside, asked the minister certain questions about buildings on Jameson Avenue and tenants who have been faced with increases of some 100% proposed by the landlord. The judge who heard their request for a temporary injunction agreed to that request, but he told them that they would need to raise some \$50,000 as a security bond if they wanted to even apply for a permanent injunction.

I want to ask the minister: Where are tenants on Jameson Avenue in south Parkdale supposed to come up with \$50,000 in order to fight their landlord?

Hon Mr Sweeney: As I indicated to the leader's colleague yesterday, it is one thing for landlords to ask for large increases; it is another thing, in fact, for them to get them. I read off to the honourable member a number of situations—and I have a fairly lengthy list—of places where the actual amount awarded was considerably less than what had been asked for.

The second point I would make is that the ongoing rent review process is in fact ongoing; no decision had yet been made.

Third, I would say to the member that there is currently a title search on that property to determine whether or not there had been an arm's-length transaction. So I believe the system as it is currently in place was a valid one and could have brought relief to the tenants.

Mr B. Rae: I heard an interesting homily on the defence of the indefensible in terms of the minister's rent review system. I did not hear an answer to my particular question. My very particular question raised the conditions imposed by the judge in question, who said that tenants who were seeking a longer injunction against repairs and renovations that they felt were unnecessary had to come up with a security bond.

I can see the lips of the Attorney General moving quietly as he seeks to give the minister his legal instructions, but I would like to ask, before the Minister of Housing turns for advice to the Hamilton Burger of the Legislature, I wonder if he could give us the answer to this question: Where are the tenants of Ontario supposed to come up with \$50,000?

These are people living in south Parkdale. They do not have a lot of money; they are facing rent increases of 103%; they are trying to stop their landlord from ripping them off. Where are they supposed to get the \$50,000?

Hon Mr Sweeney: The intent of my first answer was to describe to the honourable leader that in fact there is a

mechanism in place to assist tenants to deal with the kind of situation that they have. There is no mechanism in place in this province to provide the sums of money that the honourable leader speaks of.

Mr B. Rae: If the tenants felt that anything that was in the current law was good enough for them, they would not have felt the need to go to court to get a temporary injunction. The judge felt their case was sufficiently strong that he granted that temporary injunction. His only warning to them was, "If you want a permanent injunction, you're going to have to come up with a \$50,000 security bond."

The minister has left the tenants out in the street to fight in the courts. It is an expensive, difficult process. I want to ask him again: Where are the tenants supposed to come up with the \$50,000 in order to fight their landlord in court, which they have to do?

Hon Mr Sweeney: One of the rights of any citizen in this province, in this country, is to take a case to court if he chooses to do so. The responsibility of the government is to have a mechanism in place to deal with the particular situation. We have that mechanism in place. It has proved time and time again that it can deal with these situations. If citizens choose to take the court route, that is their right to do so. The government does not have the resources to back that up, however.

The Speaker: New question?

Mr B. Rae: I will stand down my second question on the understanding and assurance that the Minister of the Environment is attempting to get here.

The Speaker: I cannot assure the member of any member's attendance, but you wish to stand it down.

1410

Mr Runciman: We, as well, have a bit of a problem. I had a question for the Minister of Financial Institutions, who is not here. The Premier is not here, the Deputy Premier is not here. The government House leader indicated that he would deal with the question, and now he has somehow mysteriously disappeared. I am going to have to stand down—

Hon Mr Scott: Where is Mike Harris?

Hon Mr Wrye: Seven members out of 17 is a little much.

Mr Sterling: We don't have the limousines to get us here.

The Speaker: Order. I gather you are asking to stand down the two questions.

Mr Runciman: One.

The Speaker: Stand down one question.

CHILD CARE

Mrs Cunningham: My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Hon Mr Scott: Here's the Tory who is in favour of rent control. Here's the Tory in favour of pay equity. Here's the Tory against user fees. She is alone in her caucus. Let her speak.

The Speaker: The member for London North has a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services, once the Attorney General stops.

Mrs Cunningham: In February 1989 a review of more than 1,600 child care inspection reports revealed that nearly 40% of licensed child care centres did not meet provincial regulations on safety, cleanliness and quality. In November,

nine months later, the Provincial Auditor also concluded that the ministry has not adequately monitored the operations of problem child care centres.

The minister's predecessor promised to table a report of the enforcement practices review last spring. It has now been more than a year. How much longer do we have to wait for this report?

Hon Mr Scott: I thought this question would be on pay equity or user fees or something like that.

Hon Mr Beer: As the honourable member knows, I did report to the House on interim measures that we had taken to respond to the concerns over the child care centres and I can tell her that the final report will be available before the House rises; indeed, I hope very shortly.

Mrs Cunningham: In listening to the minister, I suppose this is the same response we had over a year ago: "You will get it before the House rises in the spring." That was the same one. So I would just like to remind the minister that, really, it does not matter how much money he puts into services if he does not support those services with adequate licensing reviews and enforcement. Then quality will suffer.

There are a lot of parents out there today who are remembering some of the tragedies that have taken place in child care centres over the last two or three years in Ontario. They are looking for those kinds of enforcement standards and they are certainly looking to see centres closed down when the standards are not met. So my question now is, what guarantee will you give us that parents in the next few weeks and months, before we get that review, can be assured of the quality of child care in the province?

Hon Mr Beer: I think I can make a very clear assurance to parents. As the honourable member knows, a number of steps were taken which have been implemented, for example, the poster which appears in all of the child care centres and shows clearly when the latest inspection was done and what the results of that inspection were. They are also, in terms of the ongoing inspections that my ministry carries out, clearly identified, and as a result of a number of the issues which arose over the last 18 months, we took specific steps to improve those procedures.

Indeed, with respect to licensing, we have been very firm. One of the issues was around the provisional licences that were granted. We have been reviewing those in a much more direct and immediate way to ensure that those centres that are operating will in fact be able to ensure to the parents who walk in the front door that their premises are safe and that their children are in good hands.

Mrs Cunningham: In response to the poster, we did appreciate the poster, but that came into effect last spring. The report of the auditor is some six months subsequent to the poster and we still have problems. They talk about monitoring the operations of chronic problem day care centres, not being adequately monitored. That is a problem.

On 23 November we were most interested to know that the minister is also revising child care accountability and management systems that I feel will be necessary as part of this enforcement, his own staffing. Could we expect in the report to be released in the next few weeks that the accountability and management systems will be part of the minister's report with regard to the staffing of his own ministry, and the accountability of the work that it does as part of this enforcement?

Hon Mr Beer: I can certainly assure the honourable member that the report will set out clearly the steps we are taking in

all of the areas so that parents will know that the child care centres are safe, how they are licensed, the various procedures, and the support that we provide to ensure to parents that they know these centres are places where they can safely place their children.

I would say to the honourable member that it has been our approach not to wait for the final report but indeed to act on a number of the recommendations, both that came out of the auditor's report as well as things that we discovered ourselves. I think at this point, even without the report, that I can say we have moved expeditiously to ensure that we have improved protections. I do tell the honourable member that the report will be out shortly and I believe it will contain the information and guidelines that she requests.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Runciman: My question was originally intended for the Minister of Financial Institutions. In his absence, I will be directing it to the government House leader.

The Minister of Financial Institutions has told us on many occasions that under no-fault insurance, motorists living in Metropolitan Toronto and the Hamilton-Wentworth areas will face an average 8% premium increase, and for those living outside those areas, on average, there will be no increase in premiums. I wonder if the minister today could assure us that those with good driving records living outside Metro Toronto and Hamilton-Wentworth will not face substantial increases.

An hon member: Is this a little boost for your nomination meeting?

Hon Mr Ward: I am very much tempted to do some advertising, but I will resist that temptation and respond.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Ward: The member for Welland-Thorold helped me out greatly over the course of the past few weeks and I want to express my appreciation.

To the member for Leeds-Grenville, I want to say that the government believes that average increases in the Metropolitan Toronto and the Hamilton-Wentworth area will in fact be 8% and in rural areas the average increase is expected to be 0%.

But I want to stress that those are indeed averages, that some differences of course will exist. Some people will get reductions, some people will get increases. Those are indeed averages, so if the member for Leeds-Grenville, for instance, happens to drive an Alfa Romeo or his Porsche to the Legislature, he may in fact find a higher increase than the 8%. But the numbers used are indeed averages.

Mr Runciman: Unlike many of the Liberal members of this assembly, I do not drive a foreign car.

The minister's assurance that those living outside Metro Toronto and Hamilton-Wentworth will not face premium increases on average is not correct. I have been given the proposed premium increases under no-fault that Commercial Union Assurance Co of Canada plans to implement in London. For a six-star driver—that is, a driver with no claims, convictions or accidents in the last six years—who drives less than 10 miles a day to work, the proposed increase under no-fault is 17.4%.

Will the minister reconcile the suggested 0% premium increase with the figures from Commercial Union Assurance?

Hon Mr Ward: As the member will know, I am advised that the commission has as yet not approved any rate structures

or tables at this time. That is indeed covered by the legislation and the government stands by its commitment that, on average, in the urban areas of this province there will be an 8% increase and in rural areas there will be 0% increase.

I want to stress that the member knows full well that without this legislation it is conceded by everyone that the increases for automobile insurance rates in this province would have been well in excess of 30%, on average, throughout Ontario. I believe the legislation that is before us now provides an excellent balance in terms of benefits and rates and that, on the whole, all drivers in this province benefit.

1420

Mr Runciman: We are talking about a good driver who is going to pay 17.4% more under no-fault, and that driver will be covered for only half the benefits he is now entitled to under the current system. The Minister of Financial Institutions told us on more than one occasion that safe drivers would not pay more under no-fault. The minister's statement is clearly at variance with the facts and figures I have presented here today. It is time for the government to come clean with the motorists of Ontario, tell them the truth and tell them that its pie-in-the-sky forecast of no premium increases in rural Ontario is completely incorrect.

Is the minister prepared to acknowledge that today and indicate that good drivers living outside Toronto and Hamilton-Wentworth will face significant premium increases for less coverage?

Hon Mr Ward: The government stands by its commitment that indeed the average increases will be as we have indicated. The member has already been told in previous responses that those rate structures he is referring to are indeed proposed and not approved.

Mr Wildman: When is an increase a decrease? You must be mistaken. The Premier said he was going to lower them, not increase them.

Hon Mr Ward: I would say to my friend the member for Algoma, who continues to interject, I got a lovely letter from his constituent today in Hilton Beach who, although an NDP supporter, thinks his position on this is terribly misguided. There is a lot of support for this legislation. It does in fact benefit all the drivers in this province.

Interjections.

The Chair: Order. Are you finished? Once again, we will just wait.

PAY EQUITY

Mr R. F. Johnston: The Attorney General will be glad to know I do have a question on pay equity for the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues in the province. I would like to quote the Attorney General. I remember, in 1986, when the first legislation was brought in, he said, "Child care workers in the municipalities will have male comparison groups, but those in small, non-profit child care centres may be working in all-female establishments. This bill does not deal with this. I will ask the commission to come up with solutions to deal with this and to make sure those women are not left out."

Yesterday, a coalition of people met with the ministry and were told, unfortunately, that even though they are only earning \$16,000 to \$17,000 a year, on average, this bill will not meet their needs either; it is not the appropriate bill. Why is she

leaving them in the lurch after the promise made in 1986 by the Attorney General, so strong on pay equity that he heckles the honourable member for London North?

Hon Mrs Wilson: I am pleased to answer this question from the member opposite on pay equity, and indeed, this government is very proud of our pay equity legislation, which will be the most responsive on this issue in North America.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to meet with members of the coalition for—what is the name of the group?—the coalition on pay equity, the group that is interested in this issue.

An hon member: Whoever they were.

Mr Breagh: She does not remember much.

Hon Mrs Wilson: It is a coalition of women's groups who are bringing forward their viewpoints on pay equity and who are committed to working with this government to help our legislation cover more women. The Minister of Labour has already moved to bring in proportional value. He has promised draft legislation which will make our legislation cover more women. We are proud of this legislation. We need to work further so that more women will have the opportunity to be covered by it.

As an advocate for women's issues, I am committed to working with those women's groups to be certain this legislation is indeed the finest in North America.

Mr R. F. Johnston: In spite of the final record, I can see why the minister has trouble spitting out the term "pay equity," given this government's commitment to it, or failure to it. Why is it that she is not doing what the former minister responsible for women's issues said? Why is she leaving these women who receive 73% of the income that other women earn in the province, 47% of what men earn in the province and only 57% of the average industrial wage unprotected when the commission showed her how she could protect them?

Hon Mrs Wilson: The member opposite will know that this government is committed to providing appropriate wages in the child care sector. Will we accomplish it all at once? No, we will not, but we have made important steps in doing so.

Last year, we provided some \$88.8 million in wage enhancements, which went, in particular, to women who are working in areas where their wages are not high. We have gone particularly to work with our federal counterparts, who have initiated caps on the Canada assistance plan funding. I am particularly worried that those decisions made by the federal government will make it—

Mr R. F. Johnston: CAP has nothing to do with this.

The Speaker: Order. Please take your seat.

Mr D. W. Smith: You don't want to hear the answer.

Mr Mackenzie: Pathetic answer.

Interjections.

Mr Speaker: What a waste of time. We will just wait.

CAPITAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS

Mr Jackson: My question is for the Minister of Education. Each year school boards across Ontario are sent a memorandum from the minister's office to complete a capital expenditure multi-year forecast that sets out the priorities for capital construction in each of the boards in Ontario. In November, the memorandum he sent stated as follows, "Decisions on the al-

location of funds depend upon information received from school boards and the priority given to each project."

I have been receiving an awful lot of calls from irate constituents in Liberal ridings, in particular the ridings of Kitchener, Waterloo North and Kitchener-Wilmot, who are very concerned because of the minister's 4 May capital announcements, which completely ignored the Waterloo county board's first two priorities. I am also getting a lot of irate calls from constituents in the Liberal ridings of Durham Centre, Durham York and Durham West complaining that the Durham board was not allocated any funds for the 10 priorities it outlined in 1991.

My question is simply this: These constituents in these Liberal ridings would like the minister to give them a straight answer today and tell them why their boards' priority ratings were ignored by him and his government.

Hon Mr Conway: The government is quite prepared to defend, here or anywhere else, its record in support of capital projects, both for growth and for non-growth purposes right across the province.

I repeat, thanks to the budget read by the Treasurer here a few weeks ago, the current administration has added yet another year of \$300-million worth of provincial grants, which brings over a period of some few years \$1.5 billion worth of provincial grants in support of elementary and secondary school construction.

Is the process generous? Yes. Is it fair? Yes. Is it rigorous? Yes. Is there more to be done? Of course, and we intend to carry on to meet the needs of all the regions across the province, in an evenhanded way, I might add.

Mr Jackson: Is it arbitrary? Yes. Is it dictatorial? Yes. Is it inadequate? Yes. Is it the minister's pipedream? Yes.

The fact is that trustees all across Ontario are telling this minister, who refuses to listen—trustees like Father Kennedy, a close friend of the minister's from the Hamilton-Wentworth separate board, who says, in a sense, this government seems to be taking away the local school board's responsibility to determine local needs. The reason for electing trustees is to have local people make decisions about what needs are most important. Indeed, in the Durham board, the trustees have said they were shocked. They expected that they would get—

The Speaker: Order. Is this question period? Yes.

1430

Hon Mr Conway: The invitation is so great, but I will restrain myself as usual. I would only want to observe, for the edification of the member for Burlington South, that between 1987 and 1990 this Liberal government allocated over \$90 million to the school boards in Hamilton-Wentworth, which was well over what the entire allocation was in the last year of the old Miller Tory regime, 1984-85. I repeat, in the period between 1987 and 1990 this government committed over \$90 million to the school boards in Hamilton-Wentworth, and that is well above anything that the Tory government committed in any year in the last four or five years, when it had the responsibility, a responsibility that it abjectly failed to meet in this important area.

The Speaker: The Minister of the Environment is here, so I will recognize the Leader of the Opposition for a leadoff question.

MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr B. Rae: The Minister of the Environment will no doubt know that at 8:30 this morning some 20 Ministry of the Environment investigators arrived at Varnicolor Chemical in Elmira equipped with protective rubber suits and a mobile laboratory van.

The only problem with this so-called surprise raid is that these investigators were also met by a scrum of reporters who were aware of the raid. Members of the local environment community were aware of the raid days in advance. I want to ask the minister how it could possibly be that this Eliot Ness operation on the part of the MOE would have been so advertised that they were met by the media and indeed was no kind of surprise at all?

Hon Mr Bradley: The member himself and his colleague the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore have directed questions to me on this, as have others. I think it is no secret at all that the Ministry of the Environment has been investigating this company for some period of time. They went to the site about six times in 1989. They have conducted an ongoing investigation as a result of information which has been provided by an employee of the company and as a result of other complaints and will continue their investigations, whether it is in regard to the activities taking place today or future activities. They have in fact been in and around the site previous to that and will continue to do so. It is a potentially extensive problem. We want to look at all of the angles as a ministry and I am sure that further visits will take place to this company and others.

Mr B. Rae: I cannot believe that the minister is serious in saying that the purpose of a visit by 20 people from the ministry, in which they are taking samples, in which they are doing testing, is to warn everybody in advance, to tell everybody in advance that this is what is going to be done on a Thursday at 8:30: "You'd better be ready, because we're going to be there."

How can we take seriously the minister's enforcement? The statements he has made in this House about how he is going to get the kingpins, how he is going to surprise people, how he is going to be there—how can we take those seriously, when everybody knows about it and when in fact there is advance warning of it and there is no element of surprise whatsoever?

Hon Mr Bradley: It must bother the Leader of the Opposition to know, for instance, that the conviction rate of the Ministry of the Environment is in fact over 90%. I know it would annoy him to hear that, because it does not fit into his plans when he comes into the Ontario Legislature. I understand that, having sat in opposition for some eight years.

In addition to that, both the prosecutions and the convictions of this ministry have increased dramatically since the beginning of the investigations and enforcement branch. On a daily basis, we as a ministry have people going out to various plants to conduct investigations, and will continue to do so, including this particular plant. People from the Ministry of Environment have already visited the plant and have already interviewed people who have had accusations against this company. I indicated that in the House to the member when he asked a question some time ago, and to his colleague the member Etobicoke-Lakeshore when she asked a question. Those kinds of investigations will continue for some period to come.

Mr B. Rae: We have fought for years with respect to nursing home inspections. The minister says he was in opposition for eight years; God willing, he will be in opposition again.

These things can happen, I say to the minister. But the minister knows full well that the whole nursing home inspection scene was seen as being a farce for years because the nursing homes were told in advance, and staff knew in advance, when there was going to be a so-called surprise visit. That is exactly what is happening in this instance. What the minister has here is a set of advanced warnings being given to everybody, being given to the media, being given to the entire world. The company must have known about this so-called surprise visit and this so-called surprise raid. The minister had 20 people turning up in plastic suits. He expects this kind of testing to be taken seriously when the company has had days of warning in advance before the ministry turns up? Why should the company—

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Bradley: I can only say to the member once again, because perhaps he did not hear it on the first two responses, that the Ministry of the Environment officials, whether it is the investigations and enforcement branch or others, had been investigating this matter for some period of time. I have said that on a number of occasions, not only in answers to his questions, and to the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, but to other inquiries which have been. They will continue to conduct investigations of this site and any other site, some of the information being provided by their own initiative, some of it being provided by residents and employees of the company who have been very helpful.

In terms of the material that will be collected on this occasion or any other evidence which has been collected, all of it will in fact be used in any prosecutions. While the member wants to attack the people who are employed by the government of Ontario, I wonder how the Ontario Public Service Employees Union would feel about this. But he wants to do that. I think that he will find that they will do a very good job and that if there is evidence which is found as—

The Speaker: Order. There seemed to be a fair amount of material in that answer; I did not say what kind.

1440

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr Neumann: My question is for the Minister of Transportation about transportation linkages for our community. The Highway 403 completion to Ancaster is an important priority for our community, and work was to have begun this summer. Recent stories in the news media, however, about delays because of the habitat of the West Virginia butterfly, an endangered species, have caused concern in our community despite the fact that many citizens are concerned about nature and the environment. The citizens of the community are wondering, will this delay the start of the project and is the 1996 completion date still an achievable commitment?

Hon Mr Wrye: One of the things that I have learned in my short tenure as Minister of Transportation is that almost anything that can go wrong usually does as one goes through the planning process on these highways. The honourable member is correct in pointing out that just as we were to finalize the tender documents for the first stage of Highway 403, a very important linkage between Ancaster and Brantford, there was a halt called to the process because of the presence of a habitat of what is known as the West Virginia white butterfly. We have now searched high and low in the area for the West Virginia white butterfly and have been unable to find this particular species of insect, which is protected under the Endangered Species Act.

The good news for the member and for his colleagues the Treasurer and the House leader, who are equally concerned, is that work will go ahead this summer. We expect to advertise for the first project of this very important linkage in early August and then I expect tenders will be opened right after Labour Day.

Mr Neumann: My supplementary is again about transportation linkages. As the minister knows, the community was hard hit by the Via Rail cutbacks earlier this year. We were very pleased to note the recent budget announcement that the extension of GO Transit to Brantford is under review. What can community leaders and citizens in Brantford do to demonstrate the need and feasibility of extending GO service to Brantford, to assist in the study under way?

Hon Mr Wrye: I want to congratulate the member for Brantford and indicate and acknowledge the outstanding leadership provided by him on the GO Transit issue and to point out that the review the Treasurer called for in his budget earlier this month of the potential of bringing GO rail service to Brantford, and indeed to Peterborough, is about to get under way.

Certainly, because of some of the growth and the changing patterns of employment in the area, any information that can be provided in terms of potential use of GO rail service would be very, very useful. In that regard, I know that the member, working with the mayor of Brantford, has put together in the past a petition and garnered a very large number of names. We would be very interested in hearing from those individuals on the potential for their own use of GO rail service. That would help us as the study goes forward, and I commend that to the honourable member.

WINDSOR AREA ECONOMY

Mr D. S. Cooke: In the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, I will settle for the Minister of Labour.

Perhaps the Minister of Labour will be aware that another plant closure has been announced in the city of Windsor yesterday, Stanley Home Automation, which employed 68 individuals. This is now becoming very clearly an epidemic of plant closures in my home community.

Interjections.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Maybe the Attorney General could shut up for a couple of minutes.

The Speaker: Order. Perhaps the member had better take his seat. I would ask all members once again to obey standing order 20(b).

Mr D. S. Cooke: As I was saying, another plant closure in my community was announced yesterday, Stanley Home Automation. It is clear that there is now an epidemic of plant closures in my community. As of the beginning of December until yesterday, according to figures supplied to us by the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology, there have now been 2,271 people put on notice that their plants will be closing—either have already closed or will be in the next few months. If that happened in the city of Toronto, it would be equivalent to nearly 25,000 jobs. The impact on our economy and on our community is very substantial. What are the minister and his government prepared to do to make sure that my community does not lapse into the same kind of depression that we had in the late 1970s and the early 1980s in the auto sector?

Hon Mr Phillips: I appreciate very much the concern of the member for Windsor-Riverside, as other members from Windsor have raised the same concerns.

We were very pleased to see about a week ago that the Ford company announce some major investments in Windsor. We were very pleased to hear that apparently the president of Ford announced at the annual meeting some additional investments, albeit in Oakville, but none the less a commitment to the automotive industry in Ontario.

I think both the Premier and others have indicated that we are committed, as the Treasurer noted in his budget, to ensuring that provincial jobs are spread around the province. Quite clearly, obviously, Windsor is one of the areas, among others, that the government has been looking at. I would say that I am very pleased to see Ford, with support from the provincial government, making an investment. I am very pleased to see some other new jobs created in Windsor, recognizing the difficult times. I think the Premier and others in this House have indicated that the government is looking very seriously at a variety of communities where jobs might be located by the provincial government.

Mr D. S. Cooke: No matter how hard this government attempts to promote the Ford announcement, there were 138 jobs created in that \$9-million announcement, and the jobs will not even be created for three years. I am talking about job losses of 2,200 people in my community now. We need direct intervention by this government. There have been 13 plant closures announced in the last few months, four more are on the very weak list of potential plant closures in the next few months and last fall there were six more plant closures. We have had more plant closures so far this year than in all of 1989 and 1988 added together.

I am asking the minister again: It is his responsibility and that of his government to put together a package of aid to my community which should involve decentralization of public service jobs in our community. Is the minister prepared to go to bat for our community—

The Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mr D. S. Cooke: —because obviously the local Liberal members have had absolutely no impact in delivering that promise.

Hon Mr Phillips: If the member realized how often the local members on this side of the House are beating on me, beating on the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and beating on the Treasurer and the Premier for jobs, he would not be saying that.

I would say again that I recognize the needs of Windsor. I would just, however, remind ourselves, because I look at these numbers frequently, that during the first half of the 1980s there were about 220,000 jobs created in the province; that is, the first five years of the decade. In the second five years of the decade—which coincide, I might say, with a change in government—there were well over 730,000 new jobs created in the province. That does not, however, negate the concerns of Windsor.

As I said before, the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology has been working very closely with the automotive sector. We are very pleased to see the Ford company making their announcement recently. The Premier and others in the House have indicated their concern for the Windsor area and how we are looking at Windsor, among other communities, about the possibility of additional public service jobs. We are very concerned about the Windsor area. I would say that all of the mem-

bers on this side of the House from Windsor are very concerned and are looking for solutions.

TEACHERS' LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Sterling: I am sorry that the member for Ottawa West is not here because the day before yesterday I asked a question in the Legislature at the very end. The Minister of Education indicated that the member for Ottawa West had asked the same question as I had. That is not exactly the way I have read Hansard. In fact, the member for Ottawa West made some outrageous and slanderous statements about Ottawa Board of Education trustees. He grouped them all together by saying that there were several trustees and then failed to identify those trustees even when demanded so by the Ottawa Board of Education trustees. This has driven a further wedge in between the teachers and the Ottawa Board of Education, and I would ask the Minister of Education if he would apologize on behalf of the member for Ottawa West, who is not here today.

Hon Mr Conway: Any Minister of Education has a responsibility in the course of a strike or a lockout to do all that he or she can to ensure that these kinds of difficulties are resolved at the earliest opportunity and in the best interests of the students involved. I would say to my friend the member for Carleton that like all members I am anxious to see the parties to the dispute accept their responsibilities under the collective bargaining process, and I would encourage all members to work toward a resolution of this under the existing provincial statute, Bill 100, which provides, I think, in the main a very effective process by means of which to resolve these kinds of difficulties.

Mr Sterling: The day before yesterday the member for Ottawa West said, "I am concerned about an apparent lack of good faith on the part of some of the trustees at the Ottawa Board of Education" and "Some of these trustees are now privately urging MPPs to prevail upon the Education Relations Commission not to deal with the question of jeopardy before the summer."

Does the minister believe that the member for Ottawa West is helping in this process of reconciliation and ending the strike?

Hon Mr Conway: There is no question that there is in this dispute, as in all others of my acquaintance, abundant concern on all sides that the interests of students not be lost sight of. As I have indicated to the House, in this case and in others, the Education Relations Commission has a very clear responsibility to monitor and to assist. That they are doing, as is their role and responsibility under Bill 100.

Once again, I would encourage all in the community, but most especially both parties to the dispute, to return to the table at the earliest opportunity and to resolve this expeditiously in the best interests of those students.

1450

ALTERNATIVE FUELS

Ms Oddie Munro: My question is to the Minister of the Environment. I have received correspondence from the Canadian Renewable Fuels Association, as he no doubt has, regarding the use of ethanol as a transportation fuel. In their brief they detail the environmental and sustainable developmental problems associated with the use of gasoline. Among the benefits of fuel ethanol would be improved urban air quality. Can the minister provide this House with some information on

the environmental significance of renewable fuels such as ethanol?

Hon Mr Bradley: Interestingly enough, I attended a conference where there were some experts who were dealing with the whole issue of, I guess you would say, energy conservation in the context of what is best for the environment as well in terms of fuels. It was interesting to see that it was a rather mixed result in terms of what the experts had to say. In fact, one of the individuals was from an institute in Washington that is involved with a university and quite independent on this and gave quite a balanced point of view.

There are a number of considerations that have to be taken into account with alternative fuels. Sometimes we jump quickly to an alternative fuel only to find that in terms of the environmental balance it is something which is good for society as a whole and the government.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Bradley: There seems to be some alternative fuel coming from the leader of the official opposition at the present time over there.

Anyway, I think what we have to look at in terms of total energy savings is, are there actually energy savings when you look at how that fuel is produced? In the case of methanol, as opposed to ethanol, for instance, it is produced from natural gas, which is by definition a fossil fuel. In a case of that which is produced from agricultural products, one has to look at the amount of energy that was used for those purposes. The Ministry of Energy is analysing that carefully.

Ms Oddie Munro: I would certainly appreciate a copy of any report which comes out on alternative fuels between the minister and the Ministry of Energy.

I am interested in urban air quality and I am wondering if the minister can tell me what his current initiatives are with regards to reducing vehicle emissions in Ontario.

Hon Mr Bradley: The member may recall that last summer we used in the province of Ontario low-smog gas, an initiative that was taken very quickly, the Leader of the Opposition will want to know. It was something we jumped at very quickly in terms of putting low-smog gas in the province of Ontario. He will be interested to know, as well as the member for Hamilton Centre, that no other province did that last year. I expect that some of the provinces are going to do so.

This year what is going to happen is that the use of low-smog gas will be for even a longer period of time in the summer months, when there is an evaporation, and there are certain compounds which go into the air that cause smog, which forms the lower level smog. I think we will see that improvement again this summer.

In addition to that, at the national environment ministers' meeting in October or November of last year in Prince Edward Island, Ontario and Quebec led the way in persuading the ministers present to adopt the California standards for emissions on vehicles. That will certainly make some substantial differences. We are going to do it within the timetable of California, as well, so that we will be moving in synchronization with the state that is considered to be the most progressive in terms of those vehicle emissions and the vehicle emission equipment put on.

SOLID WASTE REDUCTION

Mrs Grier: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment about solid waste, not gas this time. I am sure the minister will recall that last December members from all parties

in this House supported a resolution of mine that called for action to reduce municipal solid waste and asked the government to introduce legislation to do just that by March 1990. The government, needless to remark, took no action. So this morning the member for Hamilton West initiated a debate on legislation which had been drafted on behalf of this caucus to do what the government had failed to do and to provide for regulations to reduce solid waste. Again, it was supported on all sides.

In view of this strong support for reduction of garbage, will the minister acknowledge that his emphasis on voluntary recycling is not sufficient by itself to solve the garbage problems of this province or to meet his diversion targets, and will he move to regulate for the reduction of solid waste?

Hon Mr Bradley: Certainly there have been occasions when regulation has been by far the best route. In this specific instance I have seen among various communities, among individual groups within those communities, among some municipal leaders and others, the kind of enthusiasm for dealing with the diversion of waste from either landfill or incinerators that I have not seen before. There is an increased co-operation with all sectors of society in this regard.

I find it a little difficult when there is that kind of enthusiasm, when there is that kind of voluntary action, to come in with a sledgehammer and hit those people over the head and say, "Now you have to do this," or "You have to do that." I think some of the suggestions the member for Hamilton West made are good suggestions and I am prepared to look at those, as we are always prepared to. I do not think all the wisdom in this world resides in any particular individual party or individual member. We are prepared to assess all of those. I commend the member for Hamilton West, who I know has been concerned for some period of time about these issues, on his initiative. We will take them all into consideration.

Mrs Grier: The minister consistently, I suppose naturally, misinterprets the thrust of the question. Nobody is denying that recycling is supported, recycling is desirable, that people want to use their blue box system. The point we and municipalities and environmentalists keep trying to make to the minister is that that of itself is not enough to meet the targets of waste diversion that he himself has set. We have, just as an example, a headline in the Toronto Star that says, "Recycling is a Financial Monster," from the Durham works committee, and from the North Bay Nugget, "Council in North Bay May Have to Rethink the Blue Box Recycling Program."

Why will the minister not recognize that voluntary effort of itself, worthwhile though it may be, is not sufficient to solve the problem and that voluntary effort will only be enhanced if he will move to assume some responsibilities and to show some leadership in waste reduction? That is what is required.

Hon Mr Bradley: The member is ignoring—I am sure not intentionally; she may have just forgotten—the fact, for instance, that another way of diverting waste is that of composting, which is now becoming exceedingly popular in the province of Ontario as a result of the kind of financial assistance that the province of Ontario is providing for composting purposes.

She would recognize the amount of waste that could really be diverted if all—like she and I—would have our composters working, if we would utilize those not only on an individual basis but on a community basis in some cases. She would also know that at the last meeting of environment ministers there was a national protocol which was agreed to which in fact had packaging in it and dealt with the fact that on a national basis—

where it is important to do so because of interprovincial boundaries and different circumstances existing—there was agreement, which I think was pretty widely hailed as a good program for diverting waste.

I remind her as well that we now have over two million houses on blue box programs in the province of Ontario. We have funded 130,000 home composters already—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Interjection.

The Speaker: I appreciate that. However, some other time. New question, the member for Wellington.

TRAVEL INDUSTRY COMPENSATION FUND

Mr J. M. Johnson: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Many of my constituents have been affected by the financial collapse of Thomson Vacations. Is there enough money in the Ontario travel industry compensation fund to reimburse all the victims of this business failure?

Hon Mr Sorbara: The answer to the question is that probably there will be. The fact is, though, that we must leave the period available for making claims under the compensation fund open for a period of six months. So we will not know the total value of all of the claims in the aggregate until well into the latter part of the year. At that time we will be able to say definitively that the compensation fund is sufficiently buoyant to handle all the claims.

A couple of weeks ago we made amendments to the regulations to increase the size of the liability of the fund in the event of a failure such as this. We are fully confident that all of the claimants will be satisfied and we will know that within a six-month period.

1500

Mr J. M. Johnson: As the minister knows, on 18 December 1989 in his news release he announced: "With the Ontario travel industry compensation fund's reserves in excess of \$3.5 million, premium payments will not be required from the travel industry," said Mr Sorbara. "This waiver continues the premium holiday that started 31 December 1987 and marks the fifth consecutive six-month period that payment has not been necessary."

If the minister had kept up with inflation and kept the fund in proper reserve, would there not be lots of money now to cover the compensation and also to ensure that if anything of a similar nature happens, there will be funding available?

Hon Mr Sorbara: I guess my friend does not quite understand how the fund operates and who makes the decisions as to whether or not there are going to be levies against the travel industry which, after all, is the funder of the compensation fund. It is not the taxpayers, the people of the province, who are putting money into the fund; it is the industry itself that, under regulations, under a statute passed by this Parliament, contributes to the fund to ensure that in the event of a failure or in the event of a trip that was not delivered in the way in which it was advertised, the traveller will be appropriately compensated.

The industry itself sits on the board that regulates that fund and it determines, along with other members of the board, consumer representatives and government representatives, when the levies shall be increased or decreased or waived.

The fund had plenty of cash in it to handle claims that were anticipated. The fact that we have had a larger-than-anticipated

claim with Thomson Vacations simply means that, although payments did not have to be made last year, they will have to be made this year. But the fund itself is solvent. It has the capacity, with the new regulations, to deal with the incidents and the claims that result from Thomson.

Mr Wildman: In view of the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources, I would like to—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I missed the member for Peterborough. I am sorry.

SALE OF DISCOUNTED BEER

Mr Adams: I am glad to get my question in. It is also for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I guess from the clock that I will not have time for a supplementary.

In Peterborough there is great concern, especially in the labour community, about the sale of cheap US beer in the liquor stores. I am told the Liquor Control Board of Ontario has even been running special promotions on this cheap beer.

It seems to me there is a great unfairness here for both labour and business. In addition to this beer being cheap, discounted beer, I understand that it also avoids some of our environmental regulations.

I wonder if the minister would care to comment on this important matter.

Hon Mr Sorbara: It is interesting that my friend the member for Peterborough raises this matter today. Some of us in this House may have read reports in the paper that the fifth largest brewer in the United States has launched a 301 action against Canada because of what it considers to be unfair trade practices.

As of now, the cost of US beer is almost identical to the cost of Canadian beer sold through the Brewers' Warehousing facilities around the province. So I would not suspect that there would be an unfair competitive advantage for American beer in our LCBO stores this summer.

Last summer there was somewhat of a price differential. Notwithstanding that, it seemed that the board had ordered and had in stock more beer than it could actually sell. I think that is a phenomenon of the marketplace. But it is interesting that some would say the price of American beer is too low and the company itself is saying it is too high. I think when you put those two things together, you see that the price is a fair market price.

As far as the environmental issue is concerned, there is a specific five cents per can charged on American beer sold in the LCBO. That simply is because those cans cannot be recycled as the Canadian beer cans can be recycled, through Brewers' Retail stores.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr Ward moved that notwithstanding any previous order of the House Mr South and Mr Daigeler exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' business.

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

ONTARIO PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr South: I have a petition from the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, Local 431, Kingston Psychiatric Hospital.

"To the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas the government of Ontario as represented by Management Board of Cabinet, continues to refuse to take the matter of bargaining, the working conditions and employee benefits for some 60,000 public civil servants seriously, and

"Whereas this cavalier approach, as evidenced by the government's revolving-door approach to the assignment of their numerous negotiators does little for the morale of the employees or the confidence of the citizens of Ontario with regard to essential services;

"Therefore, be it resolved that the Honourable Murray Elston be directed to deal with these matters in a sober-minded, businesslike and expeditious manner."

It is signed by a number of my constituents.

POLICE TREATMENT OF VISIBLE MINORITIES

Mr B. Rae: I have a petition to be presented to the Solicitor General, the Premier and the Ontario Legislature through the Lieutenant Governor.

The Women's Coalition Against Racism and Police Violence has collected over 4,600 signatures since November 1989 for its petition to end police violence, which calls for the immediate establishment of a provincial independent civilian investigative body.

"Whereas the women's coalition is a broad-based coalition of over 40 women's groups in Toronto concerned over the alarming pattern of police violence and racism—

[Interruption]

The Speaker: Order. I must remind our visitors they are welcome if they do not demonstrate or applaud. If they demonstrate, they must remove themselves from the gallery.

[Interruption]

The Speaker: Order.

Mr B. Rae: The petition reads:

"In the last 15 months, we have witnessed the shooting of three black people by Metro police officers; two of them killed. The most recent, Sophia Cook, now lies in a hospital paralysed from the waist down. She was unarmed, sitting with her seatbelt buckled, when she was shot by Constable Cameron Durham.

"While the black community has been most visibly affected by police violence in the past year, this is just part of the pattern of racist and police violence in Toronto and across the country against native peoples, blacks, people of colour, women, gays and lesbians and working peoples. The recently proposed reforms made by the Solicitor General in no way meet the demands for an independent civilian investigative body called for by black and other communities affected by police violence.

"We demand that the province of Ontario set a precedent for its counterparts across the country by immediately establishing an independent civilian investigative body with broad repre-

sentation, selected by and from the communities affected by racist and other forms of police violence.

"This body must have the power to investigate, to demand that charges be laid and to recommend that disciplinary actions be taken against the officers involved."

I have assigned my signature to the first of these petitions and would respectfully submit it you.

The Speaker: Are there any further petitions?

[Interruption]

The Speaker: I had better not make any comment.

1510

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr Pelissero: Mr Speaker, pursuant to the standing order 118(d), I beg leave to present a report with respect to an appeal from a decision of the Chair of the standing committee on general government by a majority of the members of the standing committee.

The Speaker: I shall review the report of the general government committee Chairman and will advise the House at the earliest opportunity of my decision to confirm or vary the decision of the Chair of the standing committee.

Mr Runciman: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Order. I am not finished yet. In case all members are not aware, just thinking back, I believe this is the first time a matter such as this has come to the Chair's attention. This is a matter that was directed and discussed in committee. It is a request to the Chair from the committee. I believe the members have had an opportunity to discuss and make the decision in the House.

I may be anticipating something here. However, I listened very carefully to the member for Leeds-Grenville in his statement and I must say I am not able to listen to any debate on this. I will read exactly what was said in the committee and the decision that was made.

Mr Runciman: Point of order, Mr Speaker. I do not wish to engage in a debate. It is a point of order. I am rising on a point of order under standing order 123. You have now received the report from the Chair of the general government committee advising you of an appeal of the Chair's ruling by the majority of the members of that committee.

The motion of the member for Yorkview to defer the matter before the committee was ruled out of order by the Chairman. After hearing arguments from members from all three parties, I would urge you to uphold that decision.

The Speaker: Thank you. With respect, I listened carefully as the member is starting. He is again informing the Chair of what has happened in the committee. The committee decided on a report. That report has been placed before me. I will review it and return with my decision whether to agree with or vary that.

Mr D. S. Cooke: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This is the first time this matter has come before the House, and I think the concern of the opposition parties is that the decision by the majority in the committee to appeal to you has two aspects to it.

One is that their interpretation of your decision of a couple of weeks ago with regard to the Supreme Court decision does

not allow them to proceed, and there is a political aspect to that. That is, quite frankly, that the general government committee would have proceeded this afternoon. In effect, by appealing the ruling of the Chair of this committee to you, they are delaying the action on this referral by the opposition parties in exactly the same way as they wanted to by putting the motion that was ruled out of order.

The Speaker: Thank you. Order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: That is exactly what the member for Yorkview is doing. He is trying to bury this matter.

The Speaker: Order, with respect. If the members wish a decision, I will have to say that I really will not allow any further discussion because I want to look at it, if the members are interested in my making a decision.

Mr Runciman: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: On the same point, no.

Mr Runciman: No, it is not on the same point directly.

The Speaker: What is your point of order?

Mr Runciman: My point is that there is some urgency to this, and the fact that this initiative was undertaken by the Liberal majority in the committee is further delaying it.

Mr Polsinelli: You are abusing the standing orders.

Mr D. S. Cooke: You are abusing the standing orders. You don't want to talk about the Liberal Party. Keep it behind closed doors.

Mr Speaker: Order. I wish the member for Leeds-Grenville had heard what I said. I wanted to make a response to the House as quickly as I could, so I am asking that there be no further discussion.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Why don't you just be honest about this relationship?

Mr Speaker: Order, the member for Windsor-Riverside.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

TOWNSHIP OF GUILFORD ACT, 1990

Mr Eakins moved first reading of Bill Pr79, An Act respecting the Township of Guilford.

Motion agreed to.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Sweeney moved first reading of Bill 168, An Act to amend the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Speaker: Does the minister have an explanation?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I gave a fairly detailed explanation in my opening remarks. Basically, this bill provides for direct election of regional councillors.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Mr Ward: Pursuant to standing order 53, I would like to indicate the business of the House for the upcoming weeks.

For the week of 21 May, pursuant to standing order 6(a)(i), the House shall not meet next week.

On Monday 28 May, we will proceed with third reading of Bill 68, with a vote at 5:45, according to a previous resolution. On Tuesday 29 May, we will have second reading debate of Bill 114.

On Wednesday 30 May, there will be continuation of the second reading debate on Bill 114, if not previously concluded. Subsequent to that will be committee of the whole House if necessary. Following that, time permitting, we will resume the adjourned debate on the motion for adoption of the report of the standing committee on resources development on Bill 208.

On Thursday 31 May, in the morning sitting, will be private members' ballot item 51 in the name of Mrs Cunningham and ballot item 52 in the name of Mr Miclash. In the afternoon sitting, we will continue with any previously unfinished business from the week.

1520

ORDERS OF THE DAY

POLICE SERVICES ACT, 1989

Mr Ward, on behalf of Mr Offer, moved second reading of Bill 107. An Act to revise the Police Act and amend the Law relating to Police Services.

Mr Kanter: I am pleased to rise to speak in support of second reading of Bill 107. I am doing it in the place of the Solicitor General, who unfortunately—

Hon Mr Ward: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I forgot to indicate in moving second reading that, by previous agreement, I would seek unanimous consent that the time be divided among the parties this afternoon.

Agreed to.

Mr Kanter: I am pleased to rise on second reading of Bill 107. An Act to revise the Police Act and amend the Law relating to Police Services. I am speaking in the absence of the Solicitor General, who is detained on police-related business, and also in the absence of his parliamentary assistant, who unfortunately had some health problems. I do have some familiarity with the issues in the bill as a former Metro councillor in the Toronto area, and also as former parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General.

It certainly came to my attention as a Metro councillor and as parliamentary assistant that policing has changed, that the population has changed. But in many cases, the legal framework that set out the rules for policing, the formal legislation, has not changed to reflect the changes in practice. I was very pleased to see, pleased to be aware of and to some extent a part of very extensive consultations that went on with the various interest groups and parties that were involved in the Police Act.

In the fall of 1988, the Ministry of the Solicitor General held very extensive consultations with representatives of all the interest groups involved, the municipal police authorities, the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police, the Police Association of Ontario, ministry staff and staff from other ministries such as the Attorney General.

Subsequent to that, there was the report of the Race Relations and Policing Task Force, headed by Clare Lewis, which held extensive public consultations, had many, many public submissions and made a number of recommendations. I believe, Mr Speaker, if I may have your attention, there were approximately 57 recommendations that the Lewis task force made on this very important subject.

One point that I would like to emphasize—and I say this as a member of this Legislature who happens to be on the standing committee on administration of justice—is that I believe it is important to have further consultation and discussion on this bill. I know the ministry intends to have further public consultation. In fact, this morning the justice committee held a special organizational meeting in anticipation that this debate would be held this afternoon.

In preparation, if second reading is approved this afternoon, we have agreed to very widespread advertising in all the daily newspapers, in many of the weekly newspapers and in the ethnocultural press in this province, because of the important nature of the subject matter before us. We want to make sure that the population at large is well aware of the important reforms that are being proposed in this legislation.

The committee also suggested that letters be sent to a number of interested parties and groups, including those who made submissions to the Lewis task force, again because of the importance of this subject.

One of the very important aspects of this bill, I believe, is the declaration of principles found at the beginning of the bill. The proposed new act sets forward a philosophy, a basis for policing with six very important principles that, I think, should guide the thinking of policing as we move into the 1990s. I would just like to mention the six principles. I think they are appropriate to bear in mind at second reading stage, before we get into more of the detailed consideration of the technical aspects of the bill.

The first is the need to ensure the safety and security of all persons and property in Ontario. I believe, and certainly it has been my experience, this is a principle that is found throughout the population. This is not unique or limited to one group in the population, one class, one ethnic group or one multiracial group. Every citizen of Ontario wants and deserves safety and security of their person and of their property.

Second is the importance of safeguarding the fundamental rights of all residents of Ontario as guaranteed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Human Rights Code. I note that my colleague the Solicitor General has now arrived and I am sure he will have further comments on the bill later in the debate this afternoon.

The third principle is the need for co-operation between those who provide police services and the communities they serve. Again, I think that is only common sense. The most effective way to provide security of person and property is by having close co-operation between those who provide police services and the communities they serve. I think there is much better co-operation through consultation with communities rather than having a force which is unfamiliar with or alien to the community it serves.

A fourth principle is the importance of respect for victims of crime. I think this is an area where there has been developing concern in Ontario and other jurisdictions, and this bill recognizes that concern. The fifth principle is the need for sensitivity to the pluralistic, multiracial and multicultural character of Ontario's society and the sixth is the need to ensure that police forces are representative of the communities they serve.

I think there are changes in society that we all recognize. It is particularly important that the police reflect and are sensitive to these changes. They do have, in many cases, an immediate impact on people's lives, a life-or-death impact on people's lives. I think it is particularly important that police are sensitive to these changes, but I certainly do not think these changes are limited to the police.

There are many other agencies and institutions, public sector and private sector, that also face the same task that the police face of reflecting and being sensitive to these changes. Perhaps the police have a more difficult task in that they are in forefront of having to respond to these changes, but these are not changes that are limited to the police force by any means.

I just want to refer briefly to several other aspects and initiatives contained in this new legislation. One of them that I certainly do not think we should lose sight of in the broad policy considerations and principles is the fact that this new act will help the individual officer on the beat perform his or her duty better. The changes in policing have to come both at the top level and also on the beat by giving the individual officers a better idea of their duties, allowing them more latitude in terms of their service role in addition to their enforcement responsibilities and ensuring that they receive the necessary training for that responsibility. Those provisions are contained in the act in section 42 and other sections of the act.

I want to say a very brief word on the special investigations aspect of the legislation. I know that is a contentious one. I know there are views—and we have indeed seen in this chamber this afternoon people who feel very strongly—some that special investigations should be carried out entirely by civilians, others that special investigations should be carried out entirely by police officers.

In my view, the bill provides a very judicious balance whereby special investigations will be carried out, led by a civilian who will direct a team of trained investigators who are not currently members of police forces but who have experience, knowledge and expertise in things like the rules of evidence. They will have the authority to investigate incidents involving serious injury or death, including police pursuits, that may have resulted from criminal offences committed by police officers.

This is a very difficult area. I believe the bill establishes a very careful, judicious and appropriate balance, and I would note that in some ways it goes further than the Lewis task force in terms of the civilian-police ratio and balance. I think it is an appropriate balance in a very, very difficult area.

I want to conclude by saying that I think all members of this Legislature—certainly all members of the justice committee, but really all members of this Legislature—have a very important role to play in dealing with this bill in the next four weeks or so. Clearly, there have been great concerns raised in the community. There is an expectation that members of this body will respond in a sensitive manner.

1530

I think it is important that we are all aware of the extensive consultations that have preceded this day so that there is a firm base for these reforms, which I believe there is.

I think it is also important that we remain open to any further suggestions or improvements that may be made that build on this firm base. I, for one, am looking forward to my role in further consideration of this legislation in committee and back in this House. I certainly urge my colleagues on all sides to support it for second reading, and look forward to a particularly careful examination of this legislation in the committee stage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): I apologize that during the parliamentary assistant's opening remarks I was having difficulty hearing him. It was much better with the ear-phone, because we are quite a distance away from each other.

Mr Kormos: Let me start off by pointing out to the Solicitor General and to his parliamentary assistant how pleased I am to see the Solicitor General here to participate in this, albeit brief, second reading debate. It is a refreshing change from what we in the opposition were afraid was becoming a pattern on behalf of this government, and that is to say that ministers responsible for legislation were going to hide away while parliamentary assistants and others were being forced to carry the ball. It is the ministers who, during the committee process, are called upon to respond to concerns and questions, and if they are not present for second reading debate, if they are not present for submissions during the course of committee hearings, if they are not present during committee of the whole, then the effectiveness of the debate is seriously diminished. So I congratulate the Solicitor General for being here during the course of second reading of this bill this afternoon. That is number one.

Number two is to indicate that we in the New Democratic Party will not oppose this bill at second reading. We endorse very strongly the need for significant and drastic reform to our approach to policing here in Ontario, from the point of view of communities that rely upon their police officers and their police forces, from the point of view of the citizenry who interact with police officers on a daily basis in a variety of relationships, and from the point of view of police officers, those hardworking men and women in municipalities across this province and throughout this province by way of the Ontario Provincial Police force who perform a job that has indeed become more and more complex.

It is trite to say that policing has never been so complex. It is a job that has become, because of its complexity, more and more difficult, and policing performed in a community which has become more and more demanding of its police officers—I would say that the expectation level of police officers by the citizenry has never been higher than it is right now in 1990, and there is every indication that the high expectation level of the citizenry for the police is going to remain at that intense, demanding level.

We do have some concerns. There were concerns voiced on the instance of first reading back in December 1989. One of the concerns is that it had taken a number of years to get a bill which constituted a reform of policing here in the province.

Once again, credit to this Solicitor General. He promised a new Police Act upon his appointment. Well, he kept that promise, unlike his two predecessors in the government, who similarly promised and promised new police acts and amendments to the existing Police Act to deal with a variety of situations but simply did not deliver. So I feel no hesitation in commending this Solicitor General for at least delivering us the bill.

But as we indicated after first reading in December of last year, we were concerned and remain concerned that so much of this bill is not contained in the bill. Let me explain that. So much of what is going to occur as a result of Bill 107, the Police Services Act, is going to occur not as a result of legislation that is passed in this assembly and is the result of debate and discussion, but from regulation. Regulations occur at the whim of the government and they are generated in secret and, as often as not, they are generated without consultation because of that very secret nature in which they can be developed and nurtured.

So while the statute, the Police Services Act, in itself has a great deal of potential, that potential can be realized only if in fact the regulations that have to accompany it to give it any

effect are sound and meaningful. We have some real concerns about even addressing this at second reading, when the proposed regulations, the draft regulations, are not presented with it, because really, without the regulations, Bill 107, even if it were to pass third reading and obtain royal assent, would have minimal impact. It would not do much at all. Indeed, it would not be inappropriate to say it would do effectively nothing, because the regulations that have to accompany it are what will constitute the substance or the meat of it. That is what is lacking right now and that is what makes it so difficult to participate in a constructive debate about Bill 107 at this point.

We were critical and remain critical that so much of Bill 107 relies upon the regulatory powers of the government, and so much of what Bill 107 will or will not be depends upon the whim of this government without consultation with the public, least of all with the opposition.

Another concern is the seeming urgency of Bill 107 at this particular point in time. This was presented for first reading on 20 December 1989. Let's not forget something: The government controls what bills are presented for discussion and debate, does it not? The opposition has no control over that. The third party has no control over it. The government controls that. The simple fact and reality are that this government, these Liberals, have not presented Bill 107, the Police Services Act, the new Police Act for Ontario, to this Assembly for second reading until today, 17 May.

Members do not have to look far or hard to understand why, and why there is this sense of urgency on the part of the government, because the government found itself in very much of a crisis during the course of this week when there was yet another shooting of another citizen by another police officer here in the city of Toronto. This time it was a 16-year-old kid who was shot and wounded by a police officer, and once again it was a black who was shot and wounded by a Metro police officer.

We in the opposition had called upon this government month after month to use its regulatory powers under the existing Police Act to start to address some of the issues, some of the problems which may well have saved young Marlon Neal from being the victim of a police bullet.

The government, the Solicitor General, the Premier did not need Bill 107, the bill before us today for second reading, to effect those regulatory changes, to effect some policy on use of firearms, to effect some policy on training of police officers when it comes to racial relations, to effect some policy about firearms and ammunition.

1540

How long has the issue of hollow-point bullets been very much before the eyes and in the mind of this Legislature and in the mind of the public? How long have we been calling out for inquiry and study into that? We recognize that there are two sides to that issue. In fact, there are police officers in our police forces in Ontario who very much believe that the weapons and ammunition that they are currently authorized to use are inadequate for their protection—I am prepared to listen to those police officers—just as there are those who would feel that there ought to be stricter, more stringent and more rigid guidelines as to when a firearm is to be used or drawn by a police officer. I am prepared to listen to those people too, as we all are in the New Democratic Party. We have been calling out for study and consultation in that very regard, for policy and regulations being submitted by this Solicitor General and by this government to give effect to the decisions that might be made.

We have expressed concern about police commission appointments, and you know that, Mr Speaker. We have expressed some very specific concerns about police commission appointments. Back in September 1988 Dr Philip Stenning, who is a criminologist at the University of Toronto, released a study, and this study clearly showed that police commission appointments are really political appointments, rather than based on any serious discussion of merit. As he put it: "If you are interested in a seat on Niagara's Police Commission it helps to know a provincial cabinet minister...there is almost no formal investigation done into a potential appointee's background other than a criminal record check...no systematic monitoring of appointees is undertaken by provincial authorities following their appointment."

Do we have to look much further than some of the discussion in this Legislature, again, over this past week, to see how faulty the system is when it comes to appointees, either to regional police commissions or to the Ontario Police Commission? When we see that were it not for the intervention of a newspaper reporter, James Dubro, who revealed to this government that indeed there was police concern about the appointment of one DelZotto to the Ontario Police Commission—and do not forget that recommendation was alive three months—

Mrs E. J. Smith: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: That is a complete misrepresentation of the facts, as the member well knows. It has been constantly pointed out there was no appointment made.

The Acting Speaker: It is not a point of order. However, we have had the opportunity of hearing the member for London South.

Mr Kormos: If people would listen. They do not want to listen about the DelZotto recommendation, do they? It remains that three months after the DelZotto recommendation was made it was alive and well in the Solicitor General's office and was only interrupted after James Dubro made a call to that same office and revealed that police forces in New York state had expressed concern about the possibility of DelZotto—leading Liberal here in Ontario, recommended by none other than Patricia Starr to the Attorney General and then recommended by the Attorney General in due course to the Solicitor General. It was only three months after that, after a telephone call by Dubro—

Mrs E. J. Smith: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr Kormos: They do not want to hear it, do they, Mr Speaker?

Mrs E. J. Smith: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member constantly implies by his reference that there is some police record. There is absolutely no such thing. Mr DelZotto has never been convicted of any crime. I do not mind his making suggestions about police appointments, but to stand up in a public place and use his privilege to imply things that are not true, I object to that.

The Acting Speaker: You have put the Speaker in a difficult position because, of course, I have no information for evaluation. I recognized you on a point of order.

Mr Kormos: Elvio DelZotto was well known to Judge Waisberg, who conducted the 1974 commission of inquiry here in Ontario into violence in the construction industry and, according to Dubro, he was well known to the New York police, who tipped off Dubro that DelZotto was in the running for an Ontario Police Commission appointment.

It was fortunately the intervention of that reporter who blew the whistle that, within a matter of days, caused the DelZotto recommendation to be reversed.

Mr D. R. Cooke: It was not.

Mr Kormos: That is exactly in line with what Dr Philip Stenning, criminologist at the University of Toronto, says about appointments to regional police commissions. Hear what happened, Mr Speaker.

According to the study by Stenning: "If you are interested in a seat on Niagara's police commission it helps to know a provincial cabinet minister...there is almost no formal investigation done into a potential appointee's background. Other than a criminal record check, no systematic monitoring of appointees is undertaken by provincial authorities following their appointment."

As I say, that was illustrated in real life back in 1986 when Elvio DelZotto, prominent Liberal, head of the provincial wing of the federal Liberal Party, recommended by Patti Starr, referred to by the Attorney General as "our Patti" at that particular fund-raising dinner—their Patti recommended Elvio DelZotto, who was one of the major subjects of the Waisberg investigation into crime in the construction industry. As I say, we are thankful to the press for tipping off the Solicitor General's office to the fact that the New York police were interested in the fact that DelZotto was close to an appointment.

So we find it remarkable that Bill 107 all of a sudden acquires some urgency, when we have been pushing this government for years now to take some action with respect to policing here in Ontario.

We have called upon this government to establish standards when it comes to burglar alarms and the impact that has on police forces that have to rush to burglar alarms and other intrusion alarms, which results in wasted police resources—the fact that these alarm systems are installed willy-nilly, without supervision, without licensing, without checking. It not only wastes police resources in response to false alarms, but, quite frankly, it creates a dangerous scenario for those police officers who are forced into that type of action.

Communication systems: Since the 1985 special committee report made a point of pointing out the lack of compatibility between OPP radio communication and that of municipal forces, we have pointed out to this government and called upon it to establish police communication systems wherein there is some compatibility between the OPP system and the systems used by municipal police forces.

1550

But this bill has all of a sudden acquired urgency because the government is trying to backpedal its way out of a politically difficult situation. Indeed, there was yet another shooting of another black youth right here in the city of Toronto by a police officer, when in fact had the government taken action when it was urged to take action, not depended upon Bill 107 but utilized the very powers that this government has to make policy and to make regulations under the existing Police Act—

This government's reluctance, this government's failure—talk about negligence. If there was negligence, it has been this government's negligence to respond to the persistent pleas of the opposition to take action before another life is lost, before another body is maimed. What happened? Yes, another shot was fired and another kid's body was maimed before this government is confronted with a sufficiently politically volatile situation that it is prompted into some action.

What does it do? Why, it cries out for speed and urgency. It cries out with insistence that Bill 107 be dealt with now, that there be but three weeks of committee hearings for persons who would want to make submissions about policing in Ontario, about race relations here in the city of Toronto between ethnic communities and the police force, about the hiring of ethnics by this and other police forces in the province. There is a plethora of other questions that have to be asked and have to be answered and that simply will not be in the short period of time allotted by this government to a discussion of Bill 107.

There is the whole concern that all of us ought to have about policing in the north. The fact is that more and more communities are being told more and more often that their police stations are going to be shut down at midnight or at 5 in the afternoon, or that they are going to be shut down completely. In fact, more and more OPP officers are being taken from the north where they perform significant policing roles—they are the sole policing source in large, large parts of the north—being transferred into southern Ontario and not being replaced.

There is the whole concern about policing in native communities and the injustices that have been created by the failure of this government to provide meaningful input into policing in native communities.

We will support Bill 107 at second reading because we are anxious to see it go into committee, but we are also dismayed and in fact somewhat saddened by the fact that this government thinks so little of consultation with the public, not just in Toronto but from all over Ontario, that this government thinks so little of consultation with police officers, not just with their chiefs and not just with the heads of their associations. Real consultation about a new Police Act with police officers would mean going to communities across Ontario, big and small, in the north and in the remote parts of this province as well as in the industrialized and densely populated south, and talking not just to the chiefs of police detachments and police departments but talking to the constables, the men and women who put their lives on the line every single day of the year to try to make their communities safe.

They would want to talk with those communities and those communities' representatives about the dismal lack of funding by this province to communities across Ontario, which is forcing communities to effectively underpolice their cities, towns and villages. The fact is this government has transferred so much fiscal responsibility on to communities that can ill afford it. Through Bill 187, the responsibility for courtroom security was passed on to communities without any effective remuneration, creating financial burdens that those communities simply cannot bear. It is the police forces and the effectiveness of those police forces in those communities that suffer.

So yes, we will support Bill 107, but not without some serious reservations and not without some serious concerns about the ineffectiveness of the consultative process that this government says it is going to embark on, one that is prompted more by political expediency than any real interest in seeing effective consultation across Ontario on Bill 107.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mr D. R. Cooke: I listened very carefully to the member for Welland-Thorold. I think he spoke for about 20 minutes. I heard no commentary whatsoever on any of the 148 sections in this bill. I listened carefully because I thought perhaps there might be some sense of criticism of the bill, but I have not heard any criticism whatsoever of the bill.

There was some attempt to slander the appointments to certain police commissions, but perhaps he can, in his reply, indicate one solid example of one member of one police commission, of the dozens and dozens of police commissions across this province, who was not a suitable appointment. I have not heard that example.

This bill represents the culmination of Judge Lewis's interrogation and listening to submissions from all over the province. There are 57 recommendations in it. As the member for St Andrew-St Patrick pointed out, 56 of them are included in this bill, and to some extent some of them are improved in this bill.

I am on the verge of suggesting to the House, in view of the fact that the only criticism we are hearing is that it has taken a long time this spring to get this bill into the House, that the New Democratic Party in the riding of Welland-Thorold should have been a little more careful in its research before it chose its candidate in the last election.

Mr Kormos: I am flattered at the fact that a member who usually does not speak out much in this assembly—as a matter of fact, we rarely hear from him. That is not our Mr Cooke. I want people to know that. Our Mr Cooke is from Windsor. This David Cooke is from Kitchener.

For a person who so rarely participates in debates and who can do the very best he can when he comes up spouting mere platitudes, what a pathetic commentary from the member for Kitchener. Here is a government that has been shamed by its intimacy with Patti Starr, that has been shamed by its intimacy with the DelZottos and the Marco Muzzos, that has been tainted by a corruption that has permeated, not just its backbenchers but its cabinet—and that is what resulted in all of the departures from cabinet in the last cabinet shuffle—a party that is so tainted because some of its leading members are having their nominations contested.

Can you believe it, Mr Speaker, the House leader for the Liberal party having his nomination contested, the member for Sudbury having his nomination contested, the member for Hamilton Centre having her nomination contested, the member for Brampton North having his nomination contested? Here are Liberals who are not even liked by their own party. Can you believe it, Mr Speaker, their own party wants to dump them? Mississauga West is perhaps another one.

Do you know what, Mr Speaker? The memberships in their ridings, the ones who are contesting those same members' nominations, know them far better than any of us will get to know them. Their judgement is probably the best under the circumstances.

Mr Eves: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I wonder if you could clarify for us. I understand that questions, comments and rebuttals are in the standing orders. However, it is very unusual when parties have agreed to allocate the time among the three parties. We are going to run past 6 o'clock or somebody is going to run out of time here sooner or later. I wonder if we could not have agreement to dispense with the same if we are dividing the time up evenly among the three parties.

The Acting Speaker: That is a good point.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. I will listen to the honourable member for Nipigon.

Mr Pouliot: On the same point of order raised by the distinguished House leader of the third party, I would like to point

out that yes, indeed, the time will be shared and I am informed by the table that we do have 30 minutes of time left.

1600

The Acting Speaker: Order. I am getting advice from the table. I am sorry, I missed your point.

Mr Pouliot: We are informed that in terms of division we still have half an hour, 30 minutes of time, left.

The Acting Speaker: I brought this to the table's attention when we started, whether we still had questions and comments. They advised me that there was not a discussion between the House leaders, or any understanding, and that I would have to continue with questions and comments. That is why I have been doing that. You are absolutely right, it will take us past six of the clock. I can only seek direction from the House and suggest we have unanimous consent that we dispense with questions and comments so that our time allocation will get us directly to six o'clock.

Hon Mr Offer: Just on a point of clarification or order, when the two-minute allocation for questions and what not is taken, is that taken off any particular person's time?

The Acting Speaker: No. So in an attempt to reach the 6 o'clock hour, shall we have unanimous consent to do away with questions and comments and stick with the time allocation?

Agreed to.

Mr Harris: I am surprised that the Liberal members are challenging anybody in this House to point out appointments made by the Premier of this province which have not been good appointments. When I look at the cabinet and the parliamentary assistants, I find it very difficult to resist that challenge. However, knowing how little substance the Premier has to work with, perhaps he is doing the best he can. Who knows? I will resist that, though.

Mr Villeneuve: It's not easy.

Mr Harris: It is not easy.

I do want to say a few words on second reading of this bill. I want to talk as well about the process that has led to this debate today. This situation is another example of a lack of leadership. This is government by headline. It is a government that reacts instead of acts. It is headlines setting government priorities.

When we review the series of events, when we had many opportunities to act instead of waiting for more and more headlines, it really is very disconcerting to me as a parliamentarian that it has taken this long. It is very disconcerting to me as a parliamentarian that it took the initiatives of our House leader to even lead us to this debate today.

In April 1986, four years ago, the Solicitor General, the member for Kingston and The Islands, first promised to introduce a new Police Act by June of that year. About four years ago, there was a commitment from the Liberal Solicitor General to introduce a new Police Act.

In August 1988, Lester Donaldson was shot and killed by the police. At that time the member for Parry Sound, now our House leader, called upon the Premier to review the issue of race relations within the justice system and to send that to the standing committee on administration of justice for public hearings, for study and for recommendations. At that time our party, our Justice critic and the member for Parry Sound received no response.

In October, the member for Parry Sound again introduced a resolution in the House calling for a review of race relations and the criminal justice system by the standing committee on administration of justice. There was no action on the part of the Premier or on the part of this government.

Three weeks later, Michael Wade Lawson was shot and killed. In response, then, to outcries from the black community, the then Solicitor General, the member for London South, announced the establishment of the Race Relations and Policing Task Force.

The task force submitted its report over a year ago, in April 1989. No further action; just the report was submitted. That was in April 1989. In November of that year Sophia Cook was shot, some six months after the report was tabled. On 20 December 1989, the last day of the fall session, the new Solicitor General, the one in the House today, introduced Bill 107, the Police Services Act.

I congratulate the Solicitor General as two previous Solicitors General over that four-year period were unable to get an act even introduced. I congratulate him on getting the ear of the Premier and at least getting a bill introduced, albeit on the last day the House sat before Christmas.

It has remained on the order paper, sitting there dormant ever since, until yesterday when our caucus and our House leader forced the government to bring it forward to be dealt with on second reading today. In the meantime, in the absence of any leadership by the government, surely all of us would share my concern that tensions have increased within the black community, tensions have increased within the community at large of Ontario and police morale has deteriorated to an all-time low. Today's actions may help. I sincerely hope they do. The question before us is, can we repair the damage? The fundamental question is, are we responding to community needs?

Any shooting is tragic. Police shootings involving young people or members of visible minorities are especially sensitive because they raise questions about our changing society. They raise questions about the changing role of police in society and about the relationship between police and those they serve.

My sense is that reactionary statements by the Premier when incidents happen, statements like being "disturbed" and hoping for "speedy justice," do not help. In fact, they only serve to inflame the situation. Of course these situations are disturbing. Of course we must have speedy justice. I hope that subject is not open to debate. But this is no time to inflame or elevate tensions. Now is the time for leadership, for tolerance, for responding to community and police concerns that arise when these kinds of situations develop; not just ensuring that there is no racism, but also ensuring that there is no perception of racism, that there is no question of racism.

How do we do that? We deal with these matters fairly, openly, in public. We work co-operatively and responsibly with those members of the community who have ideas and who have solutions. We strive to redress systemic problems by consulting with the public, with the police and with community leaders as to what must be done. Then we act. That is why my party called for public hearings, why we called for a review of race relations by the standing committee on administration of justice some two years ago, not just today after the headlines. That is why we have called for dialogue; that is why we have called for leadership, and it must come from this government; why we have demanded public hearings on this bill and why we are appalled by the lack of them; and that is why we forced the government's hand yesterday.

1610

To underline our party's commitment to being a full partner and a player in the resolution of this important matter, I am pleased to indicate that I have asked my colleague, our party's former leader, the member for Sarnia, to serve as our representative on this committee. He will be playing a lead role in our efforts—collective efforts from all parties in this House—to restore confidence, to ease tensions and to ensure that whenever incidents such as these arise there is no question of racial motivations and there is no suggestion that anything but fairness and justice are being served.

My real regret today is that because of inaction, because of circumstances, because we have not come to grips with the whole question of the relationship between the police and visible minorities and with the question of race relations in the justice system, there are real people, there are real families, there are real individuals now in the headlines at a time of tragedy. We are dealing with a child, 16 years old. We are dealing with a family.

Could we have prevented the shooting? I do not know. I doubt we can answer that question. Could we have prevented the additional strife? Could we have prevented the additional turmoil? Could we have prevented the rise in tensions? I think we could have. I believe we can, and I believe we must, by working together and by working co-operatively, prevent it in the future.

PATRICIA STARR INQUIRY

Mr Eves: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I wonder if you could, on behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, inquire into whether or not the Speaker is going to rule on the member for Leeds-Grenville's point of order and respond to the chairman of the standing committee on general government this afternoon. I have spoken to the chairman of the committee, the member for Lincoln, and he feels—and I believe rightly so—that the committee cannot reconvene until he gets some direction from the Speaker.

For the Speaker to withhold his ruling on this very important matter beyond this afternoon's sitting of the Legislature in effect stops the committee from operating, stops the committee from planning its business when we return after our week's break on 28 May, and in fact would end up having the same effect as the motion that the member for Yorkview moved in the committee here this morning. So I would urge upon you, on behalf of the members of the House and on behalf of the committee, to try to get some response for the members of the Legislature this afternoon.

The Acting Speaker: Like the honourable House leader for the third party, I had the opportunity—not being in the chair but monitoring the proceedings in my office—of hearing what was taking place between the Speaker and the honourable member for Leeds-Grenville. I can advise the honourable House leader that I have had the opportunity of speaking with the Speaker just for a brief moment. He is deliberating on that matter at this very moment. I anticipate leaving the chair myself in approximately 15 minutes, so that either one of us will have the opportunity of answering your request before 6 of the clock.

POLICE SERVICES ACT, 1989 (continued)

Mr Curling: Bill 107, the Police Services Act, was introduced into the House as far back as 20 December 1989 for first reading. This act is to revise the Police Act, as we all know, and

to amend the law relating to police services in full recognition that the present act was inadequate to serve a society that has become more complex and at the same time more diverse in its cultural makeup. It has been five full months since the introduction and I must say that I am extremely disappointed that progress on this bill has been extremely slow.

This is not a time for one to take a political opportunity to get one's shots in, as we have seen, but to rise above this political partisan approach to realize that this is a very serious bill, a bill that is intended to go as far as to protect lives and to serve our citizens.

I have listened very carefully and many of the members of the opposition have stated that it took a very long time to come about. I think 1949 was the last time this act was amended. That was 40 years ago. In that time, our community has grown in the diversity of its cultural manner, its linguistic manner, so therefore a sensitivity that is new, a new kind of training should be done for our police who are enforcing the law.

We have a problem in the way that we police our communities. Saying that is no news to the police force. It is no news to the various communities. It is no news to the various governments, those that have governed and those that are governing now, that we do have a problem. As a matter of fact, those organizations and those individuals have been saying to governments for years, for decades, that there is a problem in the way we police and conduct our enforcement of law in this province.

This government has been in power for the last five years. It has made progress, of course, in the way it has treated visible minorities. It is sad that certain incidents have occurred to sort of shaken up the approach and the attitudes of politicians or individuals. However, we can speak of the past for years, but right now we have this opportunity in which to do something.

One of the most important things we have to do when we have a problem is to recognize that we do have a problem. I am not fully convinced that the entire community is convinced that we do have a problem. It is incumbent upon us as politicians, as legislators who are in touch with almost nine million people, to take the opportunity that democracy has allowed us to do that. The 130 members here go out to their communities each week, I am sure, and they have an opportunity to meet those communities, to say that our society has grown different and diverse and that we are enriched by it and that we must be sensitive to it.

We have seen many things happen in the past that make one wonder whether or not we understand the diversity of our community. The way that laws have been enforced and the problems we have had have indicated that we do have a problem. It has cost certain lives and we hope, as some people have indicated, it is not because of these lives that we have moved the bill forward.

1620

I can recall when the member for Kingston and The Islands was first appointed Solicitor General that he addressed that issue at the time. I recall very much and how actively the next Solicitor General, the member for London South, worked very closely with the visible minorities in consultation; there was a sense of feeling that before implementing any bill or bringing forward anything to the House, it was properly researched. She did that meticulously and with great sensitivity.

When my colleague the honourable member for Mississauga North was appointed, he carried that hard, sensitive, caring, considerate work into a process where today we have

Bill 107, and where we have seen for five months somehow by other strategies it is arriving at second reading now. I hope that my colleagues here stand above it all and stop playing partisan politics and stop getting cheap shots in, because people's lives are at stake.

Mr Speaker, I do not know how many children you have—four children, maybe; three, I gather. I have three children. I am concerned that if my children go out into the community, while we have other things that we have to be completely concerned about—the amount of rape cases I am hearing about—I am concerned when my two daughters are out late. I am concerned about the muggings. I do not want to be concerned that they are being stopped by police and then, because of some misunderstanding, they are shot; or to believe, and I do not want to believe that, that it is because of their colour or because of misunderstanding of their culture that some misunderstanding happened and they got shot.

I am one of those who strongly believe that we have a very good police force. Of course in all organizations or institutions there are bad eggs, and sometimes we have to do the weeding out of those. I am not so naïve as to think that when we legislate these acts we can feel that all things are solved. As a matter of fact that is just the beginning, because we cannot legislate attitudes. That is why I was pleased when the police forces started to implement employment equity, a recognition that they do have a problem and we should not wait on the act, we should proceed to get visible minorities and also women in the police force. Their record in regard to women is much better than attracting visible minorities.

I was at a function yesterday out in St Lawrence Heights and two very prominent and very capable police officers were there speaking about careers. The question that came to one police officer when she was expressing what a wonderful career she has chosen, to be a police officer in this wonderful city, was, "Why would you come here to recruit people to a force or to an organization that kills our people?" I was very proud of the way she handled that. She talked about her country, Canada; she spoke about her city, Toronto; she spoke about the organization, the police force, that she is now a member of and how much she believes in it. "Of course," she said, "incidents like these have caused a great struggle and a greater challenge to attract people." The people were pleased with the way she answered.

I want to say that I too believe personally in this country and its laws. I think many of these laws are inadequate today because, as I said, the diverse multicultural society that we have needs careful nurturing, careful understanding from all levels. We must be sensitive to the message that we give from this very august assembly here, the type of message that we give outside, because we are leaders in the community and the community is watching us and wanting to know where it should go and how it should go. We should not be taking petty shots at things, not immediately getting your shots in, but making sure that we build that society which will be an example to the world, because it is important.

They call this multicultural society an experiment. I do not call it an experiment. I think it is real as it develops; we are all Canadians; we make laws. Many of the immigrants who have come here recently have brought the best from their countries. They want to survive economically, they want to enjoy the social privileges of this country which they pay their taxes for, and they want to be policed properly.

I want to commend Chief McCormack. Ever since he was appointed chief of the police force I have seen the type of

leadership that was never there before; a leadership that gets to the community; a type of leadership that wants to learn more about the community; a leadership that tells the police force that we have, in the manner of policing, to be sensitive to all people; a leadership that is very efficient. I want to commend him. It is a difficult role.

I want to commend the leaders outside, the people like Charlie Roach, who for years and decades have said to governments and have said to politicians that we have a problem, the Dudley Laws who have said that we have a problem. Dr Ralph Agard, who spoke so well yesterday about accepting the fact that we have a problem so that we can deal with it, who has run his institution and his organization so effectively.

It is these people who make up a society. Many times I feel that the people are ahead of the politicians because when they speak we may feel that they do not know what they are saying, but if we listen carefully they are saying the things that are happening to them each day, they are saying to us we must be sensitive. We are the lawmakers, we are the persons to put it in those legal terms, we are the people who can employ the legal minds so that we have a law to protect all of us. We should listen more. Democracy, we said, is an expensive process. But this democracy, if we listen, is far less expensive than we think it should be, because those answers lie right within the type of things they are saying. We are representatives of the people, we must bring those words and that advice that they give us so well.

I will be supporting very strongly Bill 107 and I am sure that with the co-operation of all of us here we will have a quick transition of this bill, of course, with the public having some greater input. Last, I want to give thanks to Clare Lewis and the report of the Race Relations and Policing Task Force, which I felt was very extensive and has brought us to this level where we can debate this bill in a much more intelligent manner.

1630

Mr Farnan: In addressing this act, I want to stress first of all that the Police Services Act must represent not just the needs of the community, but the needs of police officers also.

I am reminded of the wife of an officer I know who spoke to me of her fear as her husband left for work each morning, fear for her husband's safety. There is no doubt in my mind that the men and women who do this job on our behalf also suffer fear on a daily basis.

Policing is a tough job and the job of policing is becoming increasingly more complex. There are more and more community demands. Violence, drugs, arson, gangs, disrespect for the law: this is what is out there and this is the work that we ask our police officers to undertake.

At the same time, we have to look at a government that has failed in its funding responsibility, which has resulted in under-policing. The resources of our police force are being stretched and, as you stretch, you increase the anxiety, you increase the fear and you increase the possibility of tragic accident.

The effectiveness of our force suffers as a result of the delay that has taken place. Bill 107 has been around for a considerable amount of time. The government cannot claim that it was powerless. It had the responsibility to act but it did not act. Now, in the shadow of crisis—this is too sad—we are acting in response to crisis.

I say to the government it is vitally important—as the representative of police officers in my community, knowing the kind of work they do, knowing their professionalism, knowing their commitment, I want a guarantee that in the three weeks of

hearings that take place, it will be the police officers who are front-lined, the police officers who are doing the day-to-day contact with those elements in society where risk and danger is involved.

I want those officers involved in the hearing. I do not simply want representatives of police commissions or representatives of the upper echelons of the police forces. I want the police officers on the beat, those who are critically involved, to be part of the process.

I am going to conclude my remarks. I think I have about three minutes, according to what is left to me by my caucus. I just want to say that the police officers out there have to be looking at this government and saying to themselves: "Why has it taken so long? Why is it, when this government had the opportunity to do something to protect us, it refused to do it?"

I just want to give a very simple example. I introduced a bill, Bill 145, that would ban replica guns. These guns have resulted in fatalities. They have resulted this week in 12 police cars and a SWAT team being called out at 12 o'clock at night because of a toy rifle bought for a four-year-old's birthday. Police officers are faced with these weapons and they do not have the time to go through the mental gymnastics as to whether this is a real gun. Their very life is at stake if indeed they happen to be facing a real gun.

The government had the opportunity. Over 60 police commissions across this province, over 20 police brotherhoods across this province, all urged the government to introduce the legislation. It went through first and second reading. It went through the justice committee with the support of 10 of the 11 members, with even the majority of the government supporting the bill. Police commissions and police brotherhoods have continued to report, to request the Solicitor General to bring this bill forward to give them protection, but there is no action.

That is the kind of thing I want to know. Are we simply here looking at the community or are we looking at the community in the context of police forces? I want to make absolutely sure that we are looking at the community in the context of the police force, because I believe the protection of our police officers who do this most critical job is absolutely fundamental to any Police Act that transpires from the committee hearings and that is ultimately implemented in Bill 107.

That is where I stand. I stand with the men and women who protect us. I want this act to reflect their protection and safety.

Mrs Cunningham: This is an opportunity for all of us to respond to a very real need in this province, and that is the need for safety in our communities and the need for a piece of legislation to support that kind of protection we require in these times, as in the past, through the introduction of this bill which is long overdue.

Most of us who have looked at the serious needs in Ontario in the last decade, as changes have taken place with regard to statistics around increased crime rates, fear in homes on behalf of young people and parents for safety in the streets, as we take a look at unrest in communities and the changing role of the police force and police persons as they try to protect our communities, it is with some degree of dissatisfaction that many people across the province of Ontario expected that we would be looking at a new Police Act by June 1986 when the Solicitor General of the time promised such.

It has been a long time, some five years, since we looked at the promises of the Liberal government with regard to appropriate legislation to reflect the needs of these changing times and to reflect the sincerity on behalf of the public as we try to support the police forces across the province as they try to

implement and work towards an increasingly tough job of policing in our time.

It is with some degree of sadness that in April 1989 we looked at the promises of the former Solicitor General for a new Police Act by May. We had hoped, I know, a year ago to be standing in this very House in May in support of a bill that could have been passed at that time.

However, some things have happened in the last year that have caused all of us great concern. It is with a great deal of confidence that the public of Ontario looked upon the demands of a member of our caucus as he asked for the Police Act, and not only that, as he asked to take a look at a report on race relations and the recommendations of that report.

All of these concerns have been brought to the attention of the House today, certainly over the last few weeks and months, and I am happy to see that we finally have the opportunity to speak to second reading of this bill.

To be specific about the changing role of the police in Ontario, I think all of us know this is a new era of policing, which is bringing the police and the community into a new partnership. Many years ago, many of us just looked at the policeman walking down the street as someone we could talk to and bring our complaints to—life is not that simple any more—as the police officer's role was strictly one of enforcement. Enforcing the law was the order of the day in the past. Times have changed, our society has changed, and so have the police. We demand so much more of them.

My concern around the process is directly related to the increased rate of violent crime in Ontario. I had hoped we would be dealing some time ago with all kinds of ways of looking at the real reasons for increased crime. Of course, I believe it has to do with the changing family lifestyles in our province, and certainly the degree to which we are not addressing the needs of families as they relate to property and support services, both in counselling families and providing them with the housing, with the salaries, with the money, with the opportunities for job retraining, with the opportunities for work that we had hoped, so that we do not see this increase in violent crimes.

1640

I think it is shocking to see that between 1985 and 1989 the actual number of offences of violent crimes in Metropolitan Toronto increased from 18,765 to 27,764, an increase of some 47.9%. As we take a look at the changing role of the police and the increasing crime rate, we have to then say to the government that it will be most important during the committee hearings that we listen to the front-line workers, both in families and in neighbourhoods, as they represent municipalities, as they represent school boards and as they represent the police forces themselves as they come before the committee.

Those of the public who know me well know I have not had a lot of confidence in the committee process in the past, but I believe the time has come when the government will have to listen very carefully to the front-line workers as we take a look at safety in our communities and their very serious recommendations as to how this Police Act in fact can be improved.

I will speak specifically. Some of the police commissions over the last few years have been most concerned about the government's recommending and establishing the level of service in communities—not to the extent that they do want not the direction; they do. But, at the same time, it is not fair for members of this Legislative Assembly, and especially members of the government, to stand up and talk about the level of ser-

vices that communities can expect and should expect, without giving them the finances to support those levels of services.

Now I am talking about numbers of policemen on police forces. I am also talking about the kinds of security across our province in municipalities, shopping malls and courtrooms. I think a very good example of the lack of support was when the government of Ontario, just over a year ago, said to municipalities, "We believe that courtroom security is extremely important. We're no longer paying for it," without consultation, and then asked the municipalities to raise the local mill rates to pay for that.

I would hope that during the public hearings, as we look at increased levels of service that will be required—there is no doubt—we will also look at supporting them with real taxpayers' dollars. If it is a provincial level of services required, therefore we should be paying for it at the provincial level.

At the same time I will take this opportunity to talk about a concern that was raised, I think, certainly in some of the municipalities that I have had the opportunity to visit. It has to do with the level of direct work out there protecting our citizens, community work, and the amount of paperwork that can go on in large bureaucracies.

I will be specific and talk about the use of police weapons. When the Solicitor General said that his ministry is planning on introducing regulations with the Police Act which will make it mandatory for police officers to file a report every time they draw their weapon, that may be realistic. It may be the thing to do. But I hope that will be an item of discussion before the committee, because there are mixed feelings about that. As the Solicitor General stated that he believes it should be part of a new Police Services Act, at the same time the Metropolitan Toronto Police already have to file a use-of-force report whenever they fire their guns on duty, but not when they merely pull them from their holsters.

This is just an example of increased bureaucracy that may not be necessary. A report on how often Metro officers draw their guns was sought by police commissioners last November after the shooting of Sophia Cook by Constable Cameron Durham. Police commission chairman June Rowlands said they decided to shelve the request after determining that it would be nearly impossible to collect the information. At the time, Metro police chief McCormack said that being forced to file a report could make officers apprehensive and reluctant to draw a gun when necessary.

I raise this as an example of where we should be looking for the best input we can get. We all have our own opinions, but the front-line workers will advise us as to how they can best spend their time, the most efficient way they can spend their time with the kind of resources we have in the province. Let's make their information important and let's deal with it. I hope, as we go before this committee, it will be different from the workings of that committee, certainly on some of the bills I have dealt with in the past.

There is some concern that police officers are being required to fulfil a great number of administrative tasks which reduce the number of hours they can spend on patrol. Thus, any call for additional paperwork on the part of officers must also consider how police time is best spent—on patrol or filling out forms.

I raise this as just one example of where we should be asking the public and the front-line workers, the policemen themselves, for their best advice. I think in this Legislative Assembly we have a wonderful opportunity to get the best advice without having to pay top buck for it.

We should be taking a look at the level of bureaucracy and the level of response to public input in that committee as we take a look at the Police Act and any recommendations for change through amendments to that act that may be produced by the government itself or members of the opposition parties. I speak very clearly as to my concern around process here.

I would also like to say just a little bit about police morale at this time. As everyone knows, all of us have had opportunities to talk to people who are working in the front lines, and they in fact have drawn to our attention their concern about their own work and how the public perceives them. All I can say right now is that with the requirements, as we ask them to deal with drug offences and cocaine deaths, as we take a look at the controversy around police weapon use, we should also look to them for their guidance.

We know that a recent study of police morale made a number of findings, one of which is that 85.6% of police officers feel that they do not have the same individual rights that the average citizen has. The study also found that most police officers polled were concerned about lower standards due to political interference in hiring and promotional processes. I think the members of the committee will be asking questions and I am sure the Conservative representatives on that committee will be asking very specific questions.

I will close on this note: This act is long overdue. It is something that the public has been looking for, and specifically members of police commissions across the province of Ontario. I think there are significant changes for which there will be a great deal of support. For those members of municipal councils, police commissions, our front-line workers, people who are concerned about the quality of community life and the safety of our communities, I am sure we will be getting excellent public input.

I would say in closing that everyone knows that the requirements of the people who are serving the public and protecting our communities are of utmost importance to the quality of life in Ontario. It has changed rather significantly over the last few years. We probably should have been taking a look at this particular piece of legislation a decade ago. We did not, but we have a wonderful opportunity to listen and, I think, make the changes that will best suit the needs of the public whom we all represent and the police who protect them.

I thank you, Mr Speaker, for this opportunity to speak to this legislation at this time.

Mrs Sullivan: I am very pleased to participate in the debate on Bill 107, An Act to revise the Police Act and amend the Law relating to Police Services.

I think it is useful to review once again the statement of principles that is included in the first section of the bill. This restatement of principles indicates a change in direction; it heralds a change in the philosophy of policing, and I think it really is worth while to underline. The principles say:

"1. The need to ensure the safety and security of all persons and property in Ontario.

"2. The importance of safeguarding the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Human Rights Code.

"3. The need for co-operation between the providers of police services and the communities they serve.

"4. The importance of respect for victims of crime and understanding of their needs.

"5. The need for sensitivity to the pluralistic, multiracial and multicultural character of Ontario society.

"6. The need to ensure that police forces are representative of the communities they serve."

1650

I wanted to put that statement into the record again because, for myself, particularly as a non-lawyer, it seems to me that it is very useful that the statement is made in plain English, not in legalistic gobbledegook; in words that are understandable to all and that can be supported by all. It seems to me that statement of principle reflects a change in our society away from the kind of frontier approach to policing, to policing that is based on an international cultural and social base. It reflects a need for service provision in addition to the use of force in law enforcement circumstances.

It says to us that our police forces must be representative of the communities that they serve in sex, in culture, in language and in race. There are mandatory employment equity requirements included in the bill to ensure that representation. That means that police duties, whether enforcement or community policing or public education or crime prevention, will be carried out with particular sensitivity to the needs, the aspirations and the makeup of the community that is served.

For women, I believe that is a matter of particular importance. Victims of sexual assault, spousal assault, domestic disputes or incest will welcome knowing that more women will be involved as police officers, not only in law enforcement but in providing assistance to victims at the time the crime was reported or investigated. For women, those kinds of crimes are particularly devastating. As a society, we have made some progress in recognizing them as crimes and not simply as private humiliations or rights of ownership that come with marriage.

Through initiatives in our education system, in counselling, in agency availability, in our judiciary, in policing, in many communities we have seen some progress in that area. None the less, this bill places greater emphasis and impetus on the police to deal with care with victims of crime. In fact, in the job description of the police, which includes clause 42(1)(c), we see that one of the primary jobs is, in fact, assisting victims of crime. That means that in getting the pertinent facts required to apprehend a criminal, the police must reduce the burden on the victim of the crime. They must treat them kindly. They must provide emotional support. They must introduce the victim to the legal system as a place which is protective for the victim and not as a place where the victim is made to feel a criminal.

When we consider that about a quarter of a million people in Ontario are victims of crime each year, the duty prescribed to the police in this bill is a matter of some importance to the entire province. In sum, the direction is to offer service at a standard that is clearly mandated and desired by the community.

I am quite taken with the approach to police servicing that this bill puts forward. I wanted to tell the House about some experiences in my own community, Halton, where many of the approaches that are taken by this bill have in fact been put into effect as a result of a police commission with a really expansive community orientation and a police hierarchy that is committed to community service. Under Chief James Harding and Deputy Chief John Barrett, the concept of policing in Halton has changed over the last period of time. It is rooted in the community. People of the community are involved with policing.

If you are a young person living in the River Oaks community in Oakville, you might see a police officer riding a bike through the community in the course of his or her duty. That

officer may speak Italian, may be a woman, may be a black, may be short. But that police officer will be seen and will be known in the community. In return, he will also know the community. Halton, you see, has moved to a community-based policing system. It has identified small communities rather than patrol zones as a base of operation. The same officers are on duty in each community on a daily basis. They are recognizable as part of the neighbourhood and they are known in the neighbourhood. Halton has maintained, as well, a village approach to areas with particular problems and emerging issues.

As well, in each of our policing communities the community policing officers, along with elected representatives and people who live and work in the community, hold regular meetings. They form a consultative committee and they discuss the issues and identify new problems and how to counteract those problems. They are dealing with issues as and before they are emerging. Their approach is a consultative, co-operative one and their decision-making is joint after the discussions.

As well, there are several futures teams, where police and residents look at the future demographic change and the social impact of that change in Halton. They plan ahead for them. They are ready to lead in changed circumstances and they are not willing to continue to play catch-up ball, as happens in many communities.

Last summer there was a particularly enterprising operation in Halton called PEACE, the police ethnic and cultural education program, which in fact did receive some funding from the Ministry of the Solicitor General. That project involved students from every high school in Halton. I met with that group of people. They were a mix of a United Nations of young people of sex, of race and of religion. Those people worked for the summer daily with the police, doing work that the police did, as junior policemen, if you like. As they were learning about the work of the police in Halton, the police were learning in turn about the attitudes, ethnic and cultural heritages of the young people who were involved in that program. The PEACE program will continue in Halton this summer, and I believe it has been a major step in a co-understanding and an exchange of values and of information.

Other members have spoken this afternoon about police morale. In our Halton force there is a continuing internal analysis of the view of its own professionalism, of the community support that it sees, and of the conduct of the force that is its co-workers. That self-identification, self-analysis project is designed to ensure that problems are identified and solutions brought forward before they become problems in the community.

We heard the member for Scarborough North speak eloquently earlier today about demographic change in his community. In mine, the cultural mix has proceeded much more slowly than it has in several other areas of Metropolitan Toronto and areas around it. My area is not characterized by unrest that has been brought forward with intolerance as its base. We do, however, have dynamic black, East Asian, West Indian, Chinese and other ethnic communities. They are involved now, as organizations that are working within the community, with the police and other organizations to avoid the buildup of racial tensions, and particularly those tensions of public versus police.

They insist, and rightly so, that the tall white man in the blue uniform with the shiny buttons cannot be the only type of person wearing the police officer's shoes, and our police force agrees. Now the Police Services Act, 1989, agrees too, and section 48 of that act requires an employment equity plan which will eliminate systemic discrimination within the police forces.

That kind of police work which is in effect now in Halton reflects what will be required in police servicing throughout the province, as characterized by consultation, by dialogue, by co-operation, and not characterized by confrontation.

I believe that Bill 107 provides a refreshing, welcome change. It is a clear new direction. There will be wonderful opportunities for discussion in committee of additional improvements which might be made to the bill. In my view, it is a superb start. I will be supporting this bill.

1700

Mr Pouliot: I too take pleasure and pride in addressing for only a few brief minutes, for time allocation does not allow me to dwell justly on it, this long-awaited piece of legislation, although it is somewhat flawed. Mr Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and to the attention of my distinguished colleague section 1, which sets forth the following policy:

"1. Police services shall be provided throughout Ontario in accordance with the following principles: 1. The need to ensure the safety and security of all persons and property in Ontario."

I guess for 18% of the population in the riding of Lake Nipigon, this simply does not apply. The right of communities to have the importance to have access to safeguarding, to security, is something that Ontarians take for granted, and yet the pervasive inequalities between the native population, the first Canadians and therefore first Ontarians, and the rest of Ontario is one of the shortcomings that appal society.

Since 1985, I have brought forth on several occasions, both in committee and in the assembly, the need to address the problem of native constables. On 18 October 1988, the then Solicitor General, the member for London South, answered the question related to 29 communities, not one or two, in the riding of Lake Nipigon alone, where there was no enforcement, no police officers whatsoever. They are appalling, shocking statistics.

I say with respect that if this kind of situation were to take place anywhere else in Ontario—and I am talking here about populations, settlements of 300, 400, 500 or 600 people, with no one walking the beat; not one police force on the reserve.

Mr Speaker, again with respect, I put this to you: When policing, in this case, and colour converge, I really wonder if communities are not left having to carry the guilt.

This is a letter. I am not inventing anything. I do not want to dramatize, but this is a letter dated 1 November 1989: "At the present time there are 132 special constables deployed on 67 reserves across the province."

It is the kind of arrangement whereby the federal government pays 52%, and the provincial responsibility therefore is 48%. So they take that money and they fund the need for special constables. In this case, the feds are telling the Attorney General that there will be a cutback and, yes, you have guessed it, our first Canadians, our first Ontarians, are left holding the bag, for the cutback resulted in fewer constables.

This is what the Attorney General of Ontario tells me: "In order to maintain the 52% federal and 48% provincial funding formula, spending cutbacks were implemented." The morale of the reserve was put in jeopardy simply because the feds and the province were playing ping-pong, and the focus, the reason for being, which is providing that essential service, was not addressed.

The Solicitor General makes no mention in his bill—in fact, he deletes. This is on page 4 of this act: "police officer" means a chief of police or any other police officer, but does not include a special constable, a first nations constable, a bylaw enforce-

ment officer" etc, which means that people in northern Ontario who have band status, native communities entirely made up of natives, communities of 200, 300, 400, 500 people that have made application to get reserve status but are now presently operating under band status—in other words, on provincial land, on crown land—are omitted from this bill, and I know that the Solicitor General will wish to introduce an amendment at the committee to make sure that no Ontarians are left without representation and that the spirit and the intent of this legislation are respected.

Mr Runciman: I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this very important debate, a debate that we, certainly in the Progressive Conservative Party, had been anticipating would occur some months earlier, if not years earlier, than it has occurred. We know for a variety of reasons the amendments to the Police Act were delayed, although promised a number of years ago. Some of the disruptions within the Ministry of the Solicitor General in respect to the changes of ministers perhaps may be one of the significant reasons behind the delay.

I suspect there were other reasons in terms of drafting and consultation, but when you look at the significant time period in respect to when the initial promises were made, I believe by the member for Kingston and The Islands, the then Solicitor General, it is difficult to understand why it has taken this period of time; and of course, a very high-profile shooting, I guess, in respect to what happened recently in Metropolitan Toronto and the actions of our House leader in respect to twisting the government's arm to amend its agenda so that we could deal with this very important bill today in second reading, with agreement of all three parties to deal with it quickly in second reading and get it into the standing committee on administration of justice so that we can proceed with what we hope will be meaningful public hearings. I use the word "hope" because, based on the actions of this government in respect to other important pieces of legislation that we have dealt with, we cannot be overly optimistic that the government is indeed going to listen carefully to the people who appear before the justice committee with a variety of views in respect to this act.

We simply have to look to Bill 68. The automobile insurance changes with respect to no-fault auto insurance and Sunday shopping legislation are just two examples that come to mind very quickly in respect to how the government members on justice and other government committees reacted in respect to listening to the steady stream of witnesses who had very valid concerns. But when the reports were finally tabled in this House from those committees, passage was assured by the majority of the government members on those committees, and those ultimate, final reports did not reflect in any way, shape or form the input we received during hearings on both of those bills. So I am not overly optimistic.

This is a very sensitive issue, especially in the Metropolitan Toronto area, and I guess we all appreciate that. I am sure there are some valid concerns out there among the minorities, I think especially in the Metro area, that perhaps the police forces are not dealing with them in an appropriate way. An argument can be made on the other side of that, but I think that certainly there are many very sincere people, members of the visible minority community, who genuinely believe that in many instances they are not being treated fairly and in a just manner by the police forces in this province. I am not going to say that is inaccurate. I am sure there are instances where that is indeed the case, but I do not think it is appropriate for us as legislators, or perhaps those in the media, to tar all police men and women in this province with the same brush.

I think one element of this that we have to very carefully consider when we are dealing with this act and how it is going to impact on police men and women across this province is the growing concern, especially in the Metropolitan Toronto area, in respect to increases in crime, especially violent crime, in this province. I think we have to be very careful, move very cautiously in respect to how we are going to perhaps have an impact on the ability of our police forces to adequately combat this increase in crime and violence in the streets and neighbourhoods of communities across this province.

1710

There could be a tendency, and we have seen it in the headlines recently and we have seen it in the actions of some politicians and some media types, to perhaps overreact. I think an argument can be made that perhaps over the past number of months there has been an overreaction in respect to some of the incidents. I think we are too often prepared to condemn without having the evidence before us.

In respect to what happened in the Peel region shootings, that is still before the courts. Charges have been laid in respect to the Donaldson shooting and what happened the other evening with the teenager being shot by a police officer. Perhaps the Solicitor General is privy to the details, but we in this assembly are not. Certainly the media are not, as far as I know, privy to the specific details surrounding those shootings. So for us to simply jump to the conclusion that the police were at fault here, that they were exhibiting racist tendencies in their dealings with visible minorities, I think is inappropriate and only inflames tensions between the various communities in this city and across the province. I want to urge everyone to exercise caution and restraint in terms of the rhetoric used in dealing with this situation.

I understand, as I am sure we all do, indeed how sensitive this issue can be and how easily sensibilities can be offended. But during the brief time I have to have input on this legislation, I want to essentially deal with what I consider an increasing concern, and that is the crime problem, the increased significance of violent crime in our society, and the problem especially in the Metropolitan Toronto area in respect to police morale.

I put some statistics on the record earlier this week and I want to quickly run over some of those again. We talked about the recent poll where there was an indication that the majority of women are now afraid to go out into the streets in the evenings. We have looked at increases in violent crime in Metropolitan Toronto. On the Toronto Transit Commission we have seen an increase of 17% in violent crimes in the past number of years. Between 1985 and 1989, just in Metropolitan Toronto alone, we have seen an increase of 47.9% in offences of violent crimes, and in Ontario province-wide, close to a 37% increase in violent crime. These figures include the crimes of murder, infanticide, sexual assault both with and without a weapon, assault with and without a weapon, abduction and robbery.

We know that a lot of this is related to the increased use of illicit drugs and the increased availability of illicit drugs in our society. Between 1985 and 1989 the actual number of drug offences under federal statutes in Metro Toronto again increased, from 5,083 to 9,150. That is an increase of 80% from 1985 to 1989. That is the actual number of drug offences under federal statutes. In Ontario as a whole we have seen an increase in drug offences of 36%. We can talk about cocaine deaths as

well, the significant numbers of cocaine deaths, increasing between 1985 and 1988.

We have talked about the comments of the Solicitor General in respect to regulations associated with the Police Act which will make it mandatory for officers to file a report every time they draw their weapons. I want to relate that kind of regulation the Solicitor General is talking about to the increase in violent crime and the challenges that the police man and woman face every day in this society, but especially in the large urban areas of the province.

At some point in the next couple months, I am going up to a training centre in northern Toronto, and I hope the Solicitor General can accompany me on that trip. It is a firing range which takes officers in training and indicates some of the kinds of instantaneous decisions that police officers have to make when they are out on the street in a situation where they can be faced with a perpetrator of a crime perhaps drawing a weapon—or not having a weapon—but that officer has to make a decision just like that.

What the Solicitor General is talking about in respect to regulations is not only saying that every time that officer removes a weapon from his holster he has to file a report; we are also talking about even more serious restrictions in respect to when that officer can remove a revolver from a holster and especially on firing that weapon. We certainly have concerns and there have to be restrictions in respect to that, but my concern about all of this is that we do not go overboard, that we do not further handicap the police men and women in this province who are simply, the vast majority of them, out there trying to do a job for all of us, very conscientious people.

Chief McCormack of Metro Toronto was quoted in the papers today as saying that morale is very low in respect to the charge laid in the past couple of days. We are seeing an increasing turnover in respect to police officers, especially in the Metropolitan Toronto area. I had sent to my office a recent study of police morale and I would like to put some of those findings on the record as well. It indicated that 85.6% of police officers feel that they do not have the same individual rights that the average citizen has; 70.4% of police officers polled felt segregated from the general population; close to 50% felt that the general public does not care about them as a person; 90.8% believe that politicians appease pressure groups without considering the effect it has on policing—that is, close to 100% of the police officers polled feel that politicians are appeasing pressure groups without considering the effect it has on policing—43.7% strongly agreed with the statement that police officers are frustrated with a number of individuals who use their status to intimidate.

The study found that most police officers polled were concerned about lowered standards due to political interference in hiring and promotional processes; 78% of officers agreed that police officers want wrongdoers punished, even if it is a fellow police officer; 91.9% of the respondents feel that the news media tend to portray police activities inaccurately; 91% of the officers believe that habitual lawbreakers do not receive appropriate sentences.

I could go on at length in respect to this study, and I may spend some more time at it as we go along, but I am trying to make my point in terms of the turnover impact that a number of things have created and certainly the increasing crime statistics in respect to violent crime in this city. The challenges faced by the police men and women on a day-by-day basis are contributing in a significant way to the morale problems, especially in the Metro force, and of course the initiatives of the government

and the initiatives of this chamber, I think, have to be weighed very carefully in respect to how they are going to perhaps once more have a negative impact on police morale.

There was a column in the Toronto Sun today which I thought was, in many respects, quite relevant. That was the Christie Blatchford column, briefly going into some of the details that she has experienced in respect to policing problems in the city of Toronto. I think her view is probably reflective of a great many people.

There are an increasing number of individuals in society, it seems, who have little or no value for human life. Mr Speaker, you and I over our lifetimes have seen a significant change in Ontario society. Certainly it is not heading in a promising direction. We have seen a deterioration just in the past 10 years in Metropolitan Toronto, and I certainly think that most police officers and residents of this municipality will agree. The statistics bear that out when we see such a significant increase in violent crime.

1720

These officers are facing those kinds of individuals on the street on a daily basis, people who have little if any value for human life, who are prepared to take another life just like that. What we are doing—and we have to be very cautious, as I said earlier—is perhaps handicapping officers, or we could be handicapping officers, in effect, in how they are going to be able to deal with this situation that they have to live with on a daily basis.

I cited the case of Constable Douglas Tribbling. I forget the municipality in the Metro area, but he went into a warehouse. There was a reported break and entry a couple of years ago and Constable Tribbling entered that building without his weapon drawn. He was shot. He did not have enough time to react, remove the revolver from his holster and deal with the perpetrator of the crime. He died as a result of that shooting.

We can go on at length in respect to the kinds of additional restrictions the Solicitor General is contemplating. Once again, I want to reinforce my concern that we do not in any way place police in this province in a situation where they are simply going to have an even more difficult time dealing with the ever-increasing problems they have to face.

I want to talk briefly about another element of this, and that is the question that much of this legislation seems to stem from problems in Metro Toronto, although its impact is certainly going to be felt province-wide.

One of the aspects of this legislation is the Police Complaints Board, which I believe under Bill 4 was going to be done on a voluntary basis where the municipality had the option. Under this legislation, it is going to be imposed upon the municipalities, and I believe there is a 50-50 funding formula. I am a little concerned about that, and I hope that perhaps the Solicitor General can respond when he comments during this debate, but I know that certainly a significant number of smaller communities are concerned. We have seen this government in respect to slapping new responsibilities on municipalities without adequate funding also being applied, and again that is a very serious concern.

I also wonder about some of the smaller communities with some of the smaller forces. For example, Cardinal in the riding of the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry has a police force of two officers. I suspect there are a number of other very small forces of two, three, or five officers around the province. Are they going to be compelled under this act to also establish police complaints commissions? Again, how is the funding for-

mula going to apply? Of course, as we know, many of these smaller communities have extremely limited tax bases and are going to have difficulty in assuming any additional responsibilities placed upon them by the provincial government.

I talked about police morale and I want to talk briefly about some of the things that this government has done, not only through public statements but also through some of its actions. I mentioned in this House a couple of years ago that two Metro Toronto police officers were very critical of a judge who allowed a couple of drug pushers out on to the streets. I think they had very brief sentences, a few days in the slammer, and they were out on the streets.

The two officers, who were very concerned about what was happening, made some statements to the press which were critical of the judge, critical of the justice system and how it was dealing with drug pushers in this very serious problem of illicit drugs on our streets. What was the government's response to that? The Attorney General publicly chastised those two police officers for having the temerity to criticize a judge for letting drug pushers out on to the street. He criticized those two police officers for having the guts to say: "Listen, this is wrong. This is wrong for society. This is wrong for the people of this city." What happened? They got dumped on by the Attorney General of the province.

What impact does that have on the morale of police officers in Metropolitan Toronto? Certainly not a positive impact. That is the kind of attitude we have seen personified by this government and many of its members. When we take a look at the problems in this Police Act and its delay in being brought into this House for several years, what happened? The reality is that we had the former Solicitor General, the member for Kingston and The Islands, charged by the police with improper use of a police boat and drinking on that police boat. Most of us may have considered that a minor offence, and indeed it was, but I think the reality of it was that we had the top cop in the province breaking the law and then getting up in this House shortly thereafter and making a statement advising against drinking on the waterways of this province. He had to leave office, so we had that disruption.

Then what happened? We have his successor, the member for London South, and what does she do as the top cop in this province? She appears at a police station in the middle of the night, asking about a family friend and why he is in jail. You can imagine the impact of that, Mr Speaker. You can imagine how the police force in that area felt and how the police across the province felt when it became public knowledge that the Solicitor General, the top cop in the province, was showing up and there was implied pressure placed upon that police force in respect to how they should deal with that particular individual.

We know what happened in respect to that. The Solicitor General, after significant pressure being applied by both opposition parties, had to give up her role in the cabinet of the province. There we had two successive solicitors general having to leave office for improper conduct. We cannot explain or describe it in any other way—improper conduct, the member for Kingston and The Islands breaking the law and the member for London South doing something totally inappropriate in going to a police station in the middle of the evening to inquire about an individual who had been charged. I suspect that those disruptions have been a significant reason behind why we have seen this legislation delayed for such a significant period of time.

I have talked about the Attorney General chastising police officers for just speaking the truth. I have talked about two

solicitors general having to resign their posts in cabinet. Also, we want to talk—and we have had some criticism about this, but I think it is a valid point that has to be brought forward because it raised the hackles of police officers right across this province, especially significant members of the Ontario Police Commission and a host of others in this community—about the recommendation for the appointment of Elvio DelZotto to be vice-chairman of the Ontario Police Commission.

Mr Faubert: He wasn't appointed.

Mr Runciman: We hear interjections that he was not appointed. That is true, but the recommendation was there from a gal by the name of Patti Starr, who is a friend of a lot of Liberals here, who is now being charged and who is very cosy with the Liberal government. We had that recommendation there. We have the Attorney General offering a letter of support, which he no longer has a copy of in his files. Nobody has copies of those letters in the files any more. Is that not mysterious indeed?

We have members of the police commission saying they are going to resign if that appointment goes through. There was significant pressure on the government. That is why the appointment was not made. Let's not hear this baloney in defence, "The appointment wasn't made, so we don't have to talk about it." The only reason that appointment was not made was because there was significant pressure behind the scenes on the government from some very key players in policing in this province.

So let's not have this baloney that the appointment did not go through. The reality was that key players in this government, and Patti Starr, were pushing Elvio DelZotto to be the vice-chairman of the Ontario Police Commission. That is the reality. Police officers know it. The message got out, and again it is another kick in the pants. It is another reflection of how this Liberal government looks upon law and order in this province and how it looks upon the treatment of police officials and policemen and policewomen across this province.

1730

So I am extremely concerned about where we are going with this legislation and I hope, when we have the public hearing process take place, we are not simply going to shove this through. I know we are talking about trying to get this through before the House adjourns at the end of June. I hope my party will not agree to that kind of speedy passage if we do not see the submissions by witnesses being listened to and being adhered to with respect to the final form this legislation takes.

I have talked to a number of police officers across the province with respect to the bill and I do not think there are a significant number of concerns, but there certainly are a number of concerns and they have to be addressed in an adequate way. If we are going to try to go through this usual rubber-stamping effort it is going to be difficult indeed. When we hear these witnesses, we want to pay attention to them, we want to pay heed to them and we want to act upon the testimony they deliver before the justice committee of this Legislature.

Again, we talked about the situation in Metropolitan Toronto. I think there is no question that we have to reach out to the visible minorities, especially in this particular community. We have to reach out to them, we have to get them more actively involved in policing matters, we have to encourage recruitment of visible minorities and ensure that they are playing an important key role in the communities across this province with respect to policing. I say that, at the same time again offering

the cautionary note that we must not overreact to these incidents that come along and get great media attention and banner headlines. If we overreact to those, we could be not only harming minorities in this province but harming all of us with respect to handicapping policemen and policewomen from doing an effective job in policing right across the province in terms of providing safety in the neighbourhoods and streets of this city and many other communities.

I think we have to start sending out some messages so that the policeman and policewoman, especially the cops on the beat, know there is someone there who understands the problems they are facing, know there is some empathy with respect to politicians and how they deal with legislation that is going to affect the working lives of policemen and policewomen. We have not seen those messages too clearly up to this point. We hope when this legislation comes back to the House, the actions of this government now and in the future will show much more empathy for the significant challenges facing policemen and policewomen, not only in Ontario but throughout Canada.

The Acting Speaker: The third party still had a minute remaining. Will the third party be using its minute? No.

Mr Kormos: Dibs on the minute.

The Acting Speaker: We will work that in as it goes in rotation. How long does the government have, may I ask? Seventeen minutes? It is my understanding they would like to divide the time equally, more or less. So we will hear from the Solicitor General.

Mr B. Rae: How much time have we got? That is 36 minutes; we have only got 19 left.

The Acting Speaker: That is right, but we had questions and comments and then there was unanimous agreement that we do away with questions and comments, so we are going to run over time.

Mr B. Rae: We agreed to that.

The Acting Speaker: We agreed to that, yes, we did.

Hon Mr Offer: It is my pleasure to partake in this debate on this very important piece of legislation. I had the pleasure this afternoon of listening to a number of speakers and I think in many of their particular speeches they spoke to the increasing complexity for police service in this province.

Police service is not just involved in law enforcement. Yes, that will always be important, but we are at a crossroads in policing. More and more of our police officers are involved not only in the law enforcement aspect of policing, but in a proactive type of policing, reaching out to the community, being very much a part of the community, discussing the problems of communities and solutions to those problems before they necessarily become calls for assistance.

I think this afternoon we have heard, through speeches and examples given, that police officers in this province—municipal, regional, OPP alike—have, on their own initiative, grasped that challenge and looked upon the challenge as an opportunity. In fact, one of the key components of the legislation we are dealing with embraces that whole direction in policing, that policing will not only be involved in law enforcement as a reactive type of mode, but also in a proactive force, in a reaching out to the community, in discussing matters of concern with community representatives and members.

Members of this Legislature will recall that in last fall's session this government brought forward a number of very im-

portant initiatives having to do with policing in this province. These included complex and difficult issues such as mandatory police retraining, employment equity programs, restrictions, yes, on the use of firearms, a special investigative unit, a province-wide system for a police public complaint system and a revised policy on police pursuits.

To touch on one particular aspect, one initiative, we recognize that the special investigative unit was as a result of concerns heard by persons across this province, not only the city of Toronto, but across the province, representations made to the Race Relations and Policing Task Force report stating that, yes, we have a concern that if there is a police incident where there has been a death or serious injury, police should not be investigating themselves. We listened to that particular concern and that particular recommendation and acted upon that. That particular aspect is found within this new Police Services Act.

What does it do? It addresses the concern, heard by the general public, of police investigating police. I think the important point to make here is that police representatives across this province are in support of such a unit, are in support of addressing that type of public concern. By any measure, these initiatives represent a substantial policy and legislative agenda on policing issues of an order not witnessed in Ontario in many decades. They also symbolize a dramatic evolution in the philosophical basis for policing in the province. This is reflected in the legislative framework of Bill 107, which gives these initiatives and others force and effect.

The simple fact, as I alluded to earlier, is that policing is in a period of transition. While law enforcement will always remain essential, will always be crucially important, activities which advance a new ethic of community service have moved to occupy a centre stage in policing. Increasingly the men and women of our police force are actively engaged in areas of public service such as crime prevention, education, community relations. They are involved in issues such as drug awareness, drinking and driving, driver safety, multicultural relations, sexual assault, domestic violence and victim assistance. These are the functions of the police officers of this province, those men and women who have chosen policing as a profession. These activities give shape and meaning to the contemporary concept of community policing, in which the strength of service is valued as highly as the strength of force.

1740

It was in recognition and support of this vision of the changing role of policing that I introduced the new Police Services Act. This bill does represent the first comprehensive review of policing legislation in this province in over 40 years. I have said it before: the last Police Act was passed in 1949, I introduced this police act in 1989, we are in 1990, and I believe there not to be anyone in this Legislature or outside who would deny that the province of 1990 is much different from that of 1949, much stronger, but we do need a Police Services Act which reflects the strength of this province. This legislation reflects this government's commitment to the development of a modern legislative framework for changes which now characterize policing and police community relations.

It has been prepared to serve as a cornerstone for policing not only in the 1990s but indeed into the 21st century, and in its development a lengthy and productive process of consultation was undertaken. Let me, as an aside, state that it was the culmination of consultation which was started by the member for Kingston and The Islands and the member for London South. It was their commitment, their dedication and their effort which

very much allowed me to introduce that particular piece of legislation that we speak of, last December 1989.

That process represents a very important part of how this bill was created. It talks about the importance of consultation because in the fall of 1988 representatives from municipal police authorities, the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police, the Police Association of Ontario and the Ministry of the Attorney General assisted my ministry in the formulation of this legislation. So this particular legislation is very much everyone's legislation. It is very much the consultative efforts put forward by the police association, by the municipal police authorities, by the Ministry of the Attorney General and by many others throughout this province.

We must also not forget to indicate that vital public input was put forward in this legislation. It was brought forward through the task force report on race relations and policing. It is my hope that the presentations, of course, that were heard through that task force report and found their way into this legislation, again a product of consultation, that this type and this level of consultation will continue as this bill, I trust, passes second reading and moves to the standing committee on administration of justice.

Given the scope of the proposed legislation and its importance to every community in this province, my ministry welcomes and encourages input and advice on this bill from all interested parties. We wish to build upon this legislation in partnership so that it can best serve Ontario's needs and expectations. In order to assist in this process, I want to briefly highlight a number of significant aspects of Bill 107 and in particular the principles upon which it is founded.

This legislation must serve many and sometimes competing interests. It must aim to meet the objectives of both the public and the police, and it must encourage and promote their mutual partnership. Clearly, such a successful partnership will require a careful balance; on the one hand, the need to properly equip and support our police forces to enable our police officers to do the job, to meet the responsibilities which we, not only as legislators but as members of the public, put upon them, and also the need to advance a modern social agenda which safeguards civil liberties.

Without doubt, this is a sensitive and difficult task. In support of this public and police partnership, the proposed Police Services Act sets out precise and explicit principles which will now guide the delivery of police services in Ontario. These principles include the responsibility of the police to ensure the safety and security of persons and property and the need to safeguard fundamental human rights, including those of victims of crime.

In addition, the proposed act is guided by the principle of an enhanced level of interaction between the police and the public through the promotion of community-based policing concepts and techniques. We have already, even prior to this second reading, embarked on a series of forums across this province where representatives from police communities, where representatives of community organizations sit together under one roof discussing matters of concern, discussing how those particular concerns can be addressed. I believe that to be crucially important in enhancing interaction, co-operation and understanding.

This principle will be put into place through measures such as a province-wide public complaints system, the Ontario civilian commission on police services, and civilian participation in the special investigative unit.

All of these aspects are designed to promote co-operation, understanding, and yes, increased confidence between the

police and the community they serve. This government is committed to the principle of police services which are truly reflective of and responsive to Ontario's multiracial, multicultural society.

We have in this legislation for the first time mandatory employment equity, designed to make certain that our police forces represent the communities they serve.

The principle of fair and consistent application of rights, rules and responsibilities is also carried forward in this bill. This has been done through measures such as a province-wide establishment of municipal police services boards, as well as the regulation of standards and procedures for police conduct and discipline.

Members will be aware that there is the possibility under the current Police Act that there need not necessarily be a municipal police commission. Under this particular act, it will be mandatory for every area that has a municipal and regional force to have such a municipal police services board. I believe that that will promote a community-police enhancement and interaction which will create greater understanding, co-operation, and yes, confidence.

I look forward to receiving comment on the provisions of Bill 107. I look forward to discussing the principles of this legislation, the principles upon which this legislation is founded, and in fact some of the very important aspects of this bill, those aspects dealing with employment equity, the special investigative unit, the province-wide police complaint system, disciplinary procedures not part of regulation but now part of legislation.

This government views the Police Services Act as legislation introduced at a historic crossroads in the evolution of policing in Ontario. There are but 148 sections in this legislation, 148 important sections which speak not only to just a piece of legislation, but are in effect a constitution for policing in the 1990s and the 21st century which does meet the realities and the strengths of this province.

I look forward to the full participation of members of this Legislature as we deal with this bill and see this bill enacted into law.

Ms Bryden: I am pleased to support Bill 107 because it is a long, long overdue revision of our Police Act. At least a decade under both the previous Conservative government and under the Liberal government has intervened since we were promised a new Police Act and it is unconscionable that we are waiting until this moment to deal with looking at a possible revision. In fact, I was shocked that it took another shooting of an unarmed black person to jolt the government into bringing forth this legislation.

We still do not have under our present Police Act any guidelines on the use of police chases, on the use of weapons; there is no provision for a province-wide system of handling complaints by the police through an independent body, no reform of the ways of appointing police commissions and no policies or programs to help seniors and women overcome their fears of going out after dark.

1750

I have supported the idea of a quick passage of second reading because we feel that we must get on with looking at the things that are needed in this bill. Our House leader agreed to the acceleration of the second reading only on two conditions, and I hope the House will be aware of that.

The first condition is that the bill must be referred out to the standing committee on administration of justice for more than

one or two days of public hearings, because only in that way can we find out what the public really thinks of this bill and only in that way can we really consult all people in the public, all groups and all interests, including the police and the different groups that are served by them and the whole population, as to what should be in that bill.

The second thing is that the same referral must deal with the Clare Lewis report of the Race Relations and Policing Task Force. That task force has many recommendations that should be implemented, but we have to look at them, and therefore that should be the subject also of the referral.

On those conditions I will support second reading.

Mr Callahan: For a few minutes there I thought I was not going to even have an opportunity. I would like to say at the outset of the very brief period of time that I have that I feel passionately about the system of justice. Justice of course protects our liberties, and when we deal with issues such as the police bill in this House, it should be done on a totally non-partisan basis.

In 1949 the rules for becoming a police officer were: You had to be six foot two and white Anglo-Saxon Protestant. The world has changed since 1949, but what we have to do now is to forge a bill that is going to demonstrate to the police that they are going to be dealt with fairly as well as the public.

I urge every member of this House to recognize the multi-cultural changes in our community. Many of these people come from countries where the police are not their friends. Therefore, the bill that we put through this House should be free of partisanship. We should not hear some of the comments that are made in a partisan way. We should be dealing with it, trying to forge a partnership that is fair to the police officer and fair to the public.

There is a comment in justice that says, "Justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done." I think one of the steps that have been taken in this regard with reference to police officers is the fact that the onus has been changed in terms of their own prosecution within the police force. They looked out and saw accuseds being dealt with on a reasonable-doubt basis, and they were being dealt with on a civil basis. I think that is one great step.

There are many more that I would relate to members, but I urge all members of the House in dealing with the question of the police bill to please get rid of the political rhetoric and address the bill, both here and in the justice committee when they are dealing with it, in terms of coming up with a bill that will provide an element and an appearance of fairness, not just to the citizenry of this province but also the police. If members do that, if they achieve that end, I can assure them that law and order will be maintained; liberty will be maintained.

The police force has a difficult job. We can never hire enough police officers to oversee all of us in Ontario, some nine million or ten million people, unless in fact there is fairness and a partnership arrangement between citizens and the police and both of them see it as being fair.

Mr B. Rae: I would beg the indulgence of the House to say a few words, if I may, in conclusion of the debate. I can see that my fan club down there wants me to make it as few as possible, and I can quite understand that.

It was Sir Robert Peel who, in introducing the modern police force in England 150 years ago, stated the aphorism which has been often repeated, and which is worth repeating today, that, "The police is the public and the public is the police."

Modern policing in an industrial, urban, cosmopolitan society depends for its existence on public trust. We rely on the proposition that when we leave this place we will be able to get home safely, that we will not be stopped by a police officer for no reason, that we will not be beaten up, that evidence will not suddenly be planted on us or that we will not be living in a society where there is no confidence or trust between the police and the public.

There are laws that we can put in place, and the act which is being discussed today is only the latest in those efforts to create the kind of fairness and assurance of due process that we expect. But as many people have said on all sides of the spectrum, there are limits on what the law can do. If we do not have a fundamental trust, a fundamental social bond between what the police do and the task and the challenge that they face and the nature of the society that they are policing, then frankly all the acts in the world will not make that much difference.

I think it is fair to say, and as I listen to the remarks from the member for Leeds-Grenville and the comments that have been made by the leader of the Conservative Party, I think all of us can agree that violent crime is on the increase and that the use of hard drugs has increased. The evidence from the United States is that when these drugs become more widely used, violent crime increases. This is an epidemic and a virus to which our society will be subject, as other societies have been.

We live in a society which is more violent, in which there has been an increase and an atmosphere of fear. The police are human and they are as subject to this atmosphere as are the rest of us. I know that in my riding, not too far from where I live, there are a group of apartment blocks in which the tenants complain about the use of drugs and the increasing problem with prostitution. The parents complain about it in the neighbourhood; the kids take note of it and comment on it in the schoolyard. It is fair to say that this is a world which is very different from the one which was true 20 or 30 or 40 years ago. It is the world in which we now live.

I think it is important to say that policing is not easy and the judgement calls which have to be made by police officers in moments of great strain are never easy. I think it is also important for us to emphasize that none of us wants to live in a society in which the police alone make the rules and in which the police alone enforce those rules without themselves being subject to the rule of law and without, I might add, the protection of the rule of law.

The structure of policing, the culture of policing in some societies is that of a paramilitary organization. I want to suggest to members that that is not appropriate for the kind of society in which we now live. At the same time, we understand there are circumstances and times when police officers are going to have to use force and in which the use of force will be part of the job they do.

1800

All I am saying is known to members and it is understood by everybody. I just think this community has to come together at a time when there is increased tension in our midst and when there is increased distrust and mistrust between many people and the police. If we do not face up to that problem and try to do something about it and try to address it, we are neglecting our responsibilities.

The member for Brampton South has said that we should approach this without partisanship. I am afraid part of the political reality of the parliamentary system is that partisanship is one of the ways in which we have to express ourselves. If I started

avoiding my responsibilities as Leader of the Opposition in terms of pointing out what is inadequate in this legislation, what is wrong with the legislation and what needs to be improved, I would not be doing my job.

I have been around long enough, 12 years in politics now, to realize that in majority parliaments it has not been my experience that governments have a very good habit of listening to what it is that leaders of the opposition have to suggest by means of constructive change. Somehow, when we are in minority parliaments, as I have been both federally and provincially, it is possible to make some changes happen, and it would have been far more possible for us to make changes happen if this bill had been introduced in an earlier parliament.

The Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the member's speech; however, it is 6 o'clock. I know there was agreement to give equal time. I would have to ask the House, is it your desire that we continue for another six minutes?

Some hon members: Agreed.

Mr Dietsch: No.

The Speaker: No?

Some hon members: Agreed.

Agreed to.

Mr B. Rae: It is all right, Mr Speaker. I appreciate the change of heart on the part of the member for Scarborough-Elsmere in that regard. I am sure he will not regret his decision to change his mind.

Mr Faubert: It wasn't me.

Mr Farnan: It was Dietsch.

Mr B. Rae: It was the member for St Catharines-Brock. I apologize. He obviously did not get his instructions straight.

There are aspects of this legislation that I want to deal with very directly to the minister. The first has already been stated by my colleague the member for Welland-Thorold. It is very difficult for us to take the government as seriously as it would like us to when there are some 30 areas in which we are told that the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the cabinet, can make regulations and we have not seen these regulations.

It is a continuing problem for us to know exactly what it is that the government really intends to do with respect to issues like the use of force, like questions involving the codes of offences for officers, like the procedures for the investigation of complaints—one can go on and on—to know that the areas in which the government is asking us to simply give them carte blanche are vast and are ever-growing. Mr Speaker, you can rest assured that our continued co-operation with respect to the movement towards passage of this bill depends, to some degree at least, on the government's willingness to produce clearly and categorically the regulations which it is going to be presenting.

I also want to say that I have already indicated to the government and to the minister on other occasions that we are still not satisfied of the independence of the special investigations unit that the government is establishing. While we take a certain pride in the fact that we were espousing the notion of an independent investigation of the unit, when I suggested that two years ago, the Attorney General said it was impossible, it was unparliamentary, it had never been done anywhere inside the British Commonwealth, it was unheard-of within our system of justice. The government has now accepted the principle. The question that we now have to work on is how it will in fact work in practice.

I also want to comment as a former labour lawyer and say that one of the aspects in which the paramilitary nature of the police has to be changed has to do with the rights of police officers with respect to their guarantees of due process and fairness, with respect to internal disciplinary hearings and with respect to how they are treated as employees.

I have heard what the member for Brampton South has had to say with regard to that. I think it is extraordinarily important that the police force, that members of the police as employees, because they have given up the right to strike and because, to some extent, their right to bargain with their employer is affected, obviously, by the Arbitrations Act and by the fact that they are performing work which is of such essential importance to our society—that puts an even higher burden on us as law-makers to ensure that their rights are protected and that their protection as individuals and as employees is ensured in the way in which the law works.

I think it is fair to say that the police unions or police associations have expressed concern for some time about how they respond as individuals and as employees and about their rights in response to complaints, whether those complaints are generated from the public or whether those complaints come from some internal disciplinary process. Mr Speaker, I think you will find that the powers of the chief of police are still extensive, that they are still extremely significant in so far as the management of the force is concerned and, of course, there will be some comment, I am sure, from police associations with regard to their protection.

I want to say something about the complaints process very briefly and the fact that it is now being extended across the province. This is something that we in our party have been urging for over a decade. I would tell the minister—I am sure he is aware of it—that going back to the Solicitor Generalship of Roy McMurtry and long before that, the question of the complaints process, how that needed to be extended and how we had to ensure that the public has confidence, as well as members of the force, obviously, in the fairness of the process—that is something that has to be extended. It has to include the OPP; it has to include everyone involved in policing in the province of Ontario. The public have to have a sense that there is a place they can go. The police have to have a sense that when the public make their complaints, their concerns will be heard equally, and the protection of employees and the protection of the public has somehow to be reconciled.

That is the task the committee now faces. We wish it well in its deliberations. I tell the minister, things will go far more smoothly the more quickly he is prepared to tell us what his intentions are with regard to the regulations. I can tell him I take very seriously the fact that he is giving to the cabinet extraordinary power to make regulations and, up to this point, we still do not know exactly where he intends to go. In our view, the government could have moved far more quickly on regulations, even now, than it has, and I say to the minister we need to have that information as soon as possible so that we can have a serious discussion of exactly how it is the government intends the police forces across this province to operate.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for the standing committee on administration of justice.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GENERAL GOVERNMENT

The Speaker: Earlier today, I was asked to make a ruling on a matter that came up in the standing committee. I have had occasion to review the report of the standing committee on general government and I have satisfied myself that the Chair of the committee was correct in his decision. I therefore confirm that decision.

Mr Allen: On this point and with respect to your judgement, Mr Speaker, might I just simply suggest that—

The Speaker: Order. No, I am sorry.

Ms Bryden: Mr Speaker, on a point of order—

The Speaker: What is your point?

Ms Bryden: The point is that we will not be meeting again until 28 May—

The Speaker: Order. Please take your seat. I was asked to make a decision as soon as possible. That decision has been made. It is up to the committee, and I believe you remember the committee. Please make your decisions there. Anything further?

Hon Mr Offer: I seek consent of the House to revert to motions.

The Speaker: There has been a request that the House revert to motions. Is it agreed?

Agreed to.

MOTION

REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

Mr Offer moved that the report of the Race Relations and Policing Task Force be referred to the standing committee on

administration of justice for review concurrently with Bill 107, An Act to revise the Police Act and amend the Law relating to Police Services, and report; that during its review of the said report of Bill 107 the committee be authorized to meet concurrently with the House or during any adjournment of the House, subject to the agreement of the House leader and chief whip of each recognized party; and that the committee shall report Bill 107, An Act to revise the Police Act and amend the Law relating to Police Services, and, if the committee wishes, its comments or recommendations with respect to the report of the Race Relations and Policing Task Force to the House on or before Wednesday 20 June 1990.

Motion agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

Mr Kormos: Another group of pages leaves us today. They have served their term well and they can be proud of themselves, and their parents and families and communities can be proud of them as well.

Hon Mr Offer: I rise on the same point with respect to extending our appreciation to the pages. They have now completed five weeks. I think all members of the Legislature will say that the functions which they provide to us cannot be stated too often, the importance of what they provide to us and their service. We wish them well. We know that these last five weeks have been a very good learning experience and they have met some very good friends that they will carry with them throughout their lives. I congratulate them and wish them well.

The House adjourned at 1814.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaître, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray

Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Thursday 17 May 1990

Private members' public business**Environmental Protection Amendment Act,**

1990, Bill 165	1283
Mr Allen	1283
Mr Jackson	1284
Mr Adams	1285
Mrs Grier	1286
Mr J. M. Johnson	1287
Mr Faubert	1288
Mr Pollock	1288
Agreed to	1289

Members' statements

Children's mental health services	1290
Mr Farnan	
Zebra mussels	1290
Mr Pollock	
Three for a Tree program	1290
Mr Reycraft	
Alcohol and drug treatment	1290
Mr Kormos	
Standing committee on general government	1290
Mr Runciman	
Consul General of Japan	1291
Mr D. W. Smith	
Capital funding for schools	1291
Miss Martel	
Education funding	1291
Mr Jackson	
Kathleen Taylor	1291
Mr Adams	

Statements by the ministry

Education in northern Ontario	1292
Mr Conway	
Regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton	1292
Mr Sweeney	

Responses

Regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton	1292
Mr Breaugh	
Education in northern Ontario	1292
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton	1293
Mr Sterling	
Education in northern Ontario	1294
Mr Eves	

Oral questions

Rent review	1294
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Sweeney	

Child care	1295
Mrs Cunningham	
Mr Scott	
Mr Beer	
Automobile insurance	1296
Mr Runciman	
Mr Ward	
Pay equity	1296
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Mrs Wilson	
Capital funding for schools	1297
Mr Jackson	
Mr Conway	
Ministry of the Environment investigations	1298
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Bradley	
Highway construction	1298
Mr Neumann	
Mr Wrye	
Windsor area economy	1299
Mr D. S. Cooke	
Mr Phillips	
Teachers' labour dispute	1300
Mr Sterling	
Mr Conway	
Alternative fuels	1300
Ms Oddie Munro	
Mr Bradley	
Solid waste reduction	1300
Mrs Grier	
Mr Bradley	
Travel industry compensation fund	1301
Mr J. M. Johnson	
Mr Sorbara	
Sale of discounted beer	1302
Mr Adams	
Mr Sorbara	

Motion

Private members' public business	1302
Mr Ward	
Agreed to	1302

Petitions

Ontario public service employees	1302
Mr South	
Police treatment of visible minorities	1302
Mr B. Rae	

Report by committee

Standing committee on general government	1303
Mr Pelissaro	

First readings	Motion
Township of Guilford Act, 1990, Bill Pr79 1303	Referral to committee 1322
Mr Eakins	Mr Offer
Agreed to 1303	Agreed to 1322
Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 168 1303	
Mr Sweeney	Other business
Agreed to 1303	
Second reading	Committee report 1294
Police Services Act, 1989, Bill 107 1304	Mr R. F. Johnston
Mr Offer 1318	Mr Conway
Mr Kanter 1304	Replica firearms 1294
Mr Kormos 1305	Mr Farnan
Mr D. R. Cooke 1307	Business of the House 1303
Mr Harris 1308	Mr Ward
Mr Curling 1309	Patricia Starr inquiry 1309
Mr Farnan 1311	Mr Eves
Mrs Cunningham 1311	Standing committee on general government 1322
Mrs Sullivan 1313	The Speaker
Mr Pouliot 1314	Legislative pages 1322
Mr Runciman 1315	Mr Kormos
Ms Bryden 1319	Mr Offer
Mr Callahan 1320	Adjournment 1322
Mr B. Rae 1320	
Agreed to 1321	Lists of members
	Members and their responsibilities 1323
	Committees of the Legislative Assembly 1326



36 90

36 90

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 28 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 28 mai 1990



Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 28 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

The Deputy Speaker: Before we proceed, I would like to ask all members to join me in welcoming the third group of pages to serve in the spring session of the 34th Parliament, 1990:

Natasha Allard, Port Arthur; Susan Cargill, Muskoka-Georgian Bay; Nicholas Chan, Wentworth North; Tricia Fuerth, Essex-Kent; Priya Ghandikota, Oriole; Meghan Graham, Wellington; Jennifer Grandy, Parry Sound; Sean Haberle, Leeds-Grenville; Celia Hatton, Hamilton West; Michael Johnson, Scarborough-Agincourt; Tamara Kordiuk, Parkdale; Mélisée Lafrance, Nipissing; Jennifer Logan, Durham West; Anne Marie MacDonell, Windsor-Walkerville; David Mariai, Willowdale; Karen McGlone, Lincoln; Thomas Medland, Simcoe West; Christina Milan, Renfrew North; Paul Pacitto, York Centre; Grant Poulsen, Mississauga North; Natasha Poushinsky, Essex South; Justin Rodney, Huron; Mark Wilson, Lambton; Yee Fun Wong, Riverdale.

Please welcome the pages.

TIME ALLOCATION

The Deputy Speaker: Furthermore, I would like to read a ruling that has been overdue, dating from a request on 23 April.

On Monday 23 April 1990, the member for Ottawa West raised a point of order as to whether the participation of the member for Welland-Thorold in the debate on government notice of motion 30 constituted such an abuse of the privileges of members that the Speaker would intervene and call upon another member to speak.

In his argument, the honourable member raised the privilege of freedom of speech and made reference to citation 77 in the sixth edition of Beauchesne's Rules and Forms of the House of Commons of Canada, which states that, "Freedom of speech does not mean that members have an unlimited or unrestrained right to speak on every issue. The rules of the House impose limits on the participation of members and it is the duty of the Speaker to restrain those who abuse the rules."

First, let me say that the privilege of freedom of speech is the most important privilege of members. Section 37 of the Legislative Assembly Act provides that, "A member of the assembly is not liable to any civil action or prosecution, arrest, imprisonment or damages, by reason of any matter or thing brought by him by petition, bill, resolution, motion or otherwise, or said by him before the assembly or a committee thereof." However, while a member enjoys this immunity necessary to perform his or her parliamentary work, the privilege of freedom of speech is subject to the power of the House to regulate its own internal proceedings by establishing rules of procedures or standing orders.

The statement in Beauchesne cited by the honourable member is accurate as far as it concerns the House of Commons of Canada. The rules of that Legislature specifically provide for time limits on most speeches in the House and its committees and, therefore, do not permit "an unlimited or unrestrained right to speak." The situation is different in Ontario. Except in very limited circumstances, our standing orders do not impose time limits on speeches. I remind the House that our rules were only very recently extensively amended, and there was a conscious

decision by the House not to impose general time limits on members' speeches.

In such circumstances, the Speaker is not in a position to impose time limits on members' speeches or otherwise restrain or prevent members from speaking to a matter at length, provided that there is otherwise no breach of the rules or practices of the House.

The member for Ottawa West also cited a case at the House of Commons at Westminster. On 2 February 1881, Speaker Brand terminated a debate on his own responsibility—

Mr D. S. Cooke: Are you doing this by recollection?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Yes—after a continuous sitting from 31 January to 2 February 1881, lasting 41.5 hours, during which Irish members had deliberately protracted the debate on the motion for leave to introduce the protection of person and property bill for the purpose of obstructing the business of Parliament.

An hon member: Bunch of Irish nationalists.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

In this instance, Speaker Brand declined to call upon any more members to speak, even though Irish members still wished to continue the debate and proceeded to put the question after saying that the "dignity, the credibility and the authority of this House are seriously threatened, and it is necessary that they should be vindicated." It is important to note, however, that his action was supported by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, and that the following day a resolution was adopted augmenting the Speaker's powers.

In 1882, closure was embodied in the rules. Therefore, the precedent as cited is not useful to us in this House. Although the situation upon which the point of order raised by the member for Ottawa West was based is now a moot point, I felt that it was important that I make this statement for the future guidance of the House.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Farnan: Did the Premier lie to the people of Ontario when in Cambridge, just three days before the last provincial election, he said, "I have a very specific plan to reduce auto insurance premiums"?

We all know what happened over the past three years. Prices continue to escalate and Bill 68 does nothing to guarantee either affordability or accessibility with regard to auto insurance.

Premiums will continue to go up despite the government's massive subsidy of the auto insurance industry. It is becoming virtually impossible even for good drivers to get auto insurance, and more and more drivers are being forced into Facility insurance at exorbitant rates. The only thing reduced is benefits, and these have been radically reduced.

1340

Yes the people of Ontario are looking at the facts, and they are asking questions: "Did the Premier keep his promise with regard to auto insurance? Can the word of David Peterson be trusted? Did he know what he intended to do when he made that promise on 7 September 1987?" If he did know, then surely the facts must lead the public to conclude that the Premier lied to them simply to win votes by means of promises he did not intend to keep.

The people of Ontario are left with the fundamental question, "Can we trust the word of David Peterson?" Based on his track record on the auto insurance industry, the answer is no, no, no. At least the voting public will have learned how much stock to put in the promises of the Premier which he will make in the upcoming provincial election.

The Deputy Speaker: I would like to advise the member that his language was very close to being unparliamentary.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I will invite the member to be more cautious next time, please.

VANDALISM OF JEWISH CEMETERIES

Mr Cousens: On behalf of the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party, may I express to the Jewish communities in this province and throughout the country our shock and revulsion at the vandalism which has taken place in some of their cemeteries.

We were appalled by recent reports from France and England about the desecration of Jewish cemeteries, but we are even more horrified to realize that the same thing is happening in Canada. Three times over the last few weeks, cowardly vandals operating under the cover of darkness have committed acts of hatred against this minority group.

We deplore what has happened. At the same time we must take positive steps to educate people and try to eliminate the prejudice that leads to such actions, for if one minority is threatened, we are all threatened. Acts of hatred and prejudice demonstrate lack of self-confidence when persons must establish their self-worth by attacking others.

We do not know the culprits. Perhaps they acted out of ignorance or were influenced by the prejudices of others. Whoever they are and whatever the cause, we must make sure that the full weight of society's disapproval comes down on them. Such behaviour will not be permitted.

It has been said that it is easier to smash an atom than a prejudice, but that does not mean we should stop trying; after all we finally did succeed in smashing the atom. We must do the same thing with racial prejudice.

DON LAUGHTON

Mr Sola: Don Laughton has been named Mississauga's citizen of the year for 1990. I would like to congratulate the four-member committee for this excellent choice. It is nice to see the Gordon S. Shipp Memorial Award given to this exemplary citizen of my riding, Mississauga East.

I first met Don two years ago at the official opening of the Dixie-Bloor Neighbourhood Centre where he serves as president and English-as-a-second-language instructor. Since then, we have met at various and numerous committees and meetings.

Actually, it is hard not to run into Don in Mississauga, as can be seen from his activity in the following institutions, to name but a few: Community Living, the United Way, the Canadian Autistic Society, the Canadian Cancer Society, the Parkinson Society, the Heart and Stroke Foundation, the Dixie-Bloor Neighbourhood Centre, Bethesda United Church, St Luke's Bethesda Refugee Committee and Bethesda Concert Series.

Community Living is a perfect example of Don's commitment, serving as a volunteer for 14 years, 11 as a board member and three as president. His dedication to helping refugees goes beyond belonging to committees. He has taken many under his roof and has sponsored many more.

A lifelong resident of Mississauga, Don grew up on his family's farm in the area, where he learned that you get out of life what you put into it.

As the Mississauga News aptly put it, "Volunteerism is a way of life" for Don Laughton.

DRUG ABUSE

Miss Martel: It is a sad fact that Ontario has to send people to private clinics in the United States to attend drug rehabilitation programs. So much for the rhetoric of the Minister of Health, who claims care should be available as close to home as possible. The millions of dollars spent in the US should be used to provide treatment programs and facilities in Ontario. The need is evident.

In Sudbury, Pinegate Addiction Service runs an adult program which operates at full capacity but is badly understaffed. The service provides day and outpatient treatment programs in a non-residential setting in the city. A Significant Others program is also offered weekly to teach spouses, adult children and friends how to deal with and help chemically dependent family members. The target population is adults with actual or potential dependencies.

In 1986 and 1989, Pinegate submitted funding proposals to the district health unit, but in that time the Ministry of Health has not called for proposals to be submitted so permanent funding has not been provided.

Pinegate has run the adult program for three years with moneys from the Sudbury-Algoma Hospital Foundation. This funding expired 31 March 1990. The Ministry of Health provided one-shot funding for a worker for one year to keep the program going. When this expires, the service will close due to lack of permanent funding.

If we are going to stop sending people to the US for treatment, then programs and facilities are needed in Ontario. The adult program at Pinegate should be supported on a permanent basis.

GREATER TORONTO AREA RAPID TRANSIT

Mr Cousens: There has been an uneasy silence since the announcement by the Minister of Transportation regarding transit initiatives for the greater Toronto area. We know that a number of projects have been announced and that a transportation committee has been established to set up an implementation schedule.

However, there are a number of things that the public does not know and has a right to know. For example, who are the key decision-makers on this committee? What is their frame of reference for determining which projects are undertaken first? What are the criteria for private sector involvement? What plans are in place should Toronto become the host city for Expo 2000, which is to be announced some 17 days from now, or for the 1996 Olympics, to be announced 113 days from now? How much weight is being given to these events?

The minister's hesitation in clearly defining his priorities is leading to confusion and frustration. There have been signs of serious infighting between certain municipalities in competing for their community's projects.

Tomorrow I will be making a brief presentation to the TTC board of commissioners. There are a number of concerns which my party is committed to addressing as we chart a course for transportation in Metropolitan Toronto and the greater Toronto area.

The public will be underwriting these expensive ventures. They have a right to be kept informed on a regular basis and to be given an opportunity for input. Our party will continue to work towards ensuring that this will be the case.

VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

Mr Ballinger: On Friday evening I was extremely pleased to be invited to attend the annual volunteer awards night in my hometown of Uxbridge.

Well over 300 volunteers and staff were in attendance to pay tribute to some very special people who were being honoured by their peers for their outstanding contribution to their community.

I would like at this time to pay special recognition to seven volunteer firefighters who were collectively honoured for their many years of competent service in the protection of the citizens of Uxbridge.

Each of these volunteer firefighters has held down regular jobs as well as meeting the demands on a daily basis that come with the responsibility of working as volunteer firefighters.

Fire Chief Norm James has been a firefighter in Uxbridge for 38 years; Harvey Acton, an old friend, for 36 years; Murray Taylor, 29 years; Pete Catherwood, 29 years; Jack Gordon, 30 years; Bob Noble and Earl Yake, for 20 years.

At a time when society's demands on governments at all levels are increasing, it is great to represent a riding such as Durham-York where there are still many volunteers like the seven I have just mentioned who have put the needs of their community first and foremost time and time again.

I salute those volunteer firefighters for providing such an essential service and I am sure the awards they received from both the federal and the provincial government will be displayed proudly and hopefully recognized by them as outstanding achievements.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Hampton: The government's auto insurance charade continues. Over the past 12 months the government has been telling consumers in Ontario that, all other factors being equal, the annual insurance rate increases are limited to 8% or less, and insurance companies cannot suspend individual auto insurance contracts without a valid reason. But what is happening out there to consumers of auto insurance shows that, once again, the Peterson government's actions fall far short of its promises.

Recently, an elderly gentleman from the community of Rainy River came to me with his 1989 insurance policy and his 1990 insurance policy. He has a 30-year, clean-driving record. He drives a car that is over 10 years old. But in his 1990 insurance policy the insurance company tried to increase his rate by over 50%—no explanation, no reason, just that the 1990 policy was going to be over 50% greater than in 1989.

The consumer and my constituency office objected to the increase and, after a long list of apologies, the insurance company reduced the rate. But these kinds of increases and abuses are going on all across the province of Ontario. The minister in charge of insurance has very little to say about it; in fact, he wants to ignore it. We have little to show us that the third new government attempt is going to be any better; in fact, it could be a lot worse.

1350

MUNICIPAL FINANCES

Mr Brandt: Tomorrow the Association of Municipalities of Ontario will make its annual submission to cabinet. Traditionally, this is when cabinet listens to Ontario's municipalities and works with them to deliver the best programs possible.

There has been, however, a drastic change over the past five years. What was once a good working relationship has turned into a battleground where the province is passing on program after program to the municipalities. The government is saying, "You must deliver courtroom security, pay equity, social assistance reforms, the municipal-industrial strategy for abatement and a dozen other provincial initiatives, and you must pay for them out of your own pocket."

The latest setback for municipalities came in the budget. The two new crown corporations for water and sewers and property assessment will charge municipalities for their services. Local governments have no choice now but to raise taxes or cut programs. Taxes are going up in Essex county by 25% this year because of inadequate provincial transfers. In London, the Premier's backyard, half of the entire tax increase is directly attributable to the offloading policies of this government, and in some areas blue box programs and road repairs are being cut as a direct result of these provincial problems. The taxpayers at the local level cannot afford any more taxes.

SKI CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr Kozyra: It is an honour for me to rise in the House today to announce that the city of Thunder Bay has just been chosen to host the 1995 World Nordic Ski Championships. Thunder Bay's bid for this major winter sports event was approved on Saturday by the Fédération internationale de ski congress held in Montreux, Switzerland.

More than 500 athletes from 30 countries are expected to compete at the World Nordic Games, which will involve 10 days of ski-jumping, cross-country skiing and nordic combined competitions at the world renowned Big Thunder National Ski Training Centre.

The government of Ontario is delighted to join forces with the federal government, the Canadian Ski Association and the good people of Thunder Bay to bring the ski championships to this province. The Ministry of Tourism and Recreation will provide up to \$5 million in support of the event. In turn, the games will promote Ontario as a major tourism and sports destination and will bring \$35 million in economic benefits, including more than 125 person-years of employment to northwest Ontario.

The games will leave a legacy of improved facilities for Thunder Bay residents and visitors. They will contribute to the athletic and personal development of our athletes, but they will also add to the skills and experience of a great many coaches, officials, administrators and volunteers. We can count on those very people to help make the event a milestone in amateur sport in the province, and that, in turn, will encourage Ontarians, particularly northern residents, to participate in recreation activities.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

ENVIRONMENTAL PURCHASING POLICY

Hon Mr Ward: This government shares with the people of our province a profound concern for the wellbeing of our environment. We want to make decisions and choices that will help ensure a legacy of clean air, clean water and clean land for our children. Recent decisions by our government have reflected that concern: protecting the Temagami wilderness, preserving the Rouge Valley, committing ourselves to reducing waste disposal by 25% by 1992 and 50% by the year 2000, creating an internationally renowned blue box program, adopting a waste-cutting program for the civil service.

Today we are unveiling a new weapon in the battle to protect our environment: our government's purchasing policy. Each year, the Ontario government purchases more than \$2 billion worth of goods and services. That represents enormous purchasing muscle. My ministry, the Ministry of Government Services, has a leadership role in setting the policy that determines how that money is spent. We believe the purchasing policy of our government represents a powerful tool for promoting waste reduction, reuse and recycling, conservation and the development of environmentally beneficial products and industries.

Today I am very pleased to announce a new environmental purchasing policy for Ontario, a policy that makes our province a leader in the field. To protect our environment, to promote the wise use of resources and to provide a role model for the broader public and private sectors, supplies, equipment and services purchased by our government will now support the 3Rs of waste management—reduction, reuse and recycling—and the conservation of energy and water.

To implement this initiative, specifications and selection criteria for the purchase of supplies, equipment and services will take into consideration the 3Rs and minimize the use and disposal of environmentally harmful materials. Ministries will now give consideration to suppliers who recognize our environmental concerns in the provision of their goods and services. Suppliers whose products or services meet our quality standards, are priced competitively and are also environmentally sensitive will enhance their opportunities to win government contracts.

We want to use our purchasing practices to encourage and support those suppliers of goods and services who advance the intent of our policy. We will move ahead in this regard with some carefully planned measures.

First, we will establish mandatory standards for designated products which contain specified levels of recycled content from post-consumer waste. Second, we will eliminate overspecification and unnecessary restrictions on goods and services that hinder the implementation of this policy. Third, we will use, where applicable, product specifications that are consistent with the national guidelines in minimum recycled content specifications issued by Environment Canada under the Environmental Protection Act, section 8.

To further support our new environmental purchasing policy, our government will designate goods and services which further the 3Rs of waste management and the conservation of energy and water. An interministerial steering committee on procurement, chaired by my ministry, will have responsibility for making recommendations to the government on the designation of mandatory environmental standards for these goods and services.

In support of this new purchasing policy, we will build a list of goods and services that lend themselves to the application of environmental considerations; we will establish and maintain minimum acceptable specifications for designated goods and services in conjunction with other jurisdictions; we will build a list of suppliers who are capable of providing designated goods and services and we will establish and maintain collective purchasing agreements for designated goods and services that must be used by all ministries.

Our new purchasing policy is effective immediately. It will be implemented as quickly as reasonably possible. Our ability to buy green immediately will be directly related, in many cases, to the availability of products.

Private industry in Canada has already begun to recognize public concerns about the environment. Many forward-looking businesses supply products and services for environment-conscious consumers which may well be appropriate for purchase by our government. For example, there is a wide range of products available that can substitute for products harmful to the environment, such as those made from or containing CFCs or such as toxic cleaning compounds. Appliances and fixtures are increasingly available to conserve water and energy, from energy-saving lightbulbs to water-conserving washroom fixtures. Waste-reducing products on the consumer market include double-sided photocopiers and packaging-reduced goods. Products that encourage recycling include recycled fine papers, retreaded truck tires and re-refined lubricating oil for cars and trucks.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

1400

Hon Mr Ward: I am especially pleased to note today that my own Ministry of Government Services is already well involved in environmentally sound practices. We are actively promoting the use of recycled products in the Ontario government workplace. Our collective purchasing section has established contracts valued at nearly \$7 million in 1990-91 for the supply of recycled paper products such as printing stock, envelopes, photocopy paper, hand towels and tissue paper.

In addition, we have introduced a line of environmentally sensitive products for use in our offices. These items are being distributed under the name "Greenline" through our office products centre, the central supply service for the government.

Today, some 70 Greenline products are available, with many more to come. The Greenline includes a wide range of paper products, such as bond paper, envelopes, memo pads and folders, all containing at least 50% recycled paper. Another Greenline product provides an excellent example of waste reduction: The use of rechargeable toner cartridges for laser printers will eliminate the need for truckloads of bulky plastic cartridges that would have to be hauled away for disposal.

Another example of waste reduction will curtail the use of polystyrene cups here in the Legislative building and in government offices at Queen's Park and in Downsview. Starting this week, some 11,500 government employees will receive these recycled glass coffee mugs bearing a message promoting recycling. By eliminating disposable cups in those offices, we will save some 2,000 cubic yards of garbage each year.

Since we launched our waste management program last October, the practice of workplace recycling in Ontario government offices has expanded from Metropolitan Toronto to provincial buildings across the province. Province-wide, government employees will divert some 1,500 metric tonnes of waste away from disposal this year.

Our list of examples goes on. We are now recycling phone books and directories. We are setting a good example of reuse with our surplus office furniture and equipment. This year, our surplus assets management section will redistribute \$2 million worth of these goods. We are even embarking on a pilot project in the largest government cafeteria in the Macdonald Block to collect food waste and sell it as livestock feed. Every little bit helps.

Our government is pushing ahead on the largest fronts and the smallest fronts in this most important battle of our times, the battle to protect our environment. It is my hope that, through our actions, we can demonstrate to the public and to the corporate sector the wisdom and profound importance of environmentally sound policies and practices.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

Hon Mrs Caplan: Today, I would like to pay tribute to St John Ambulance on the occasion of its celebration of St John Week in Ontario. This week, 70 branches throughout Ontario will be participating in events marking the Order of St John's sterling history of service and dedication.

St John is renowned as the oldest charitable organization in the world. The order's symbolic white cross has been present in Ontario since 1884, when its first recorded class was held at the Royal Military College in Kingston. Since then, St John in Ontario has trained about 2.5 million people in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation, better known as CPR, and health care. The Volunteer Brigade of St John has helped more than

three million residents in Ontario, from healing blisters to saving lives.

St John's volunteers sprang into action in the aftermath of Hurricane Hazel and at the Mississauga train derailment, and they have even assisted at forest fires in northern Ontario. There are more than 7,000 such unpaid volunteers in Ontario providing emergency first aid services at community events across the province. Last year, nearly 3,000 St John certified volunteer instructors trained more than 190,000 Ontario residents in first aid and CPR. That is a remarkable achievement.

The Ministry of Health provides training grants to St John to assist in its training program. This year, the ministry grant is \$347,000.

Marching with the times, St John Ambulance now has an industrial training program to reduce on-the-job accidents.

I am sure the members of this House join me in commending St John Ambulance on its long, proud history and its contribution to the people of Ontario.

RESPONSES

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

Mr Reville: The New Democrats enthusiastically join in the tribute paid to the St John Ambulance and the more than 7,000 volunteers who work tirelessly in our communities and now in our plants. But I noticed that 10 minutes were left in the time allotted to ministerial statements and I cannot believe that the Minister of Health did not stand up and say something about the Ajax and Pickering General Hospital, where elderly people are being hosed down in broom closets because the government has not got on with the expansion that is so desperately needed.

I do not know why they do not use the time that they have allotted; perhaps tomorrow.

ENVIRONMENTAL PURCHASING POLICY

Mrs Grier: We welcome the statement today by the Minister of Government Services and we think it is high time that this government had an environmental purchasing policy for Ontario. We had, of course, read about today's announcement in the Toronto Star and we were well aware of it before it was announced in this House.

I think it is significant to remind the government that it is not exactly a world leader in this regard. Over 20 United States jurisdictions have developed procurement policies favouring recycled goods and material. In 1987, 60 per cent of the paper purchased by New York state contained recycled material. In Maryland, the policy is that 40 per cent of the state's paper purchases contain 80 per cent recycled content. I am very glad that Ontario is finally getting around to putting in place an environmental purchasing policy.

I hope we will not spend years and months reinventing the wheel and may perhaps be open to learning from the experience in other jurisdictions as we begin to build the list of services and goods that the minister has said will have to be built before the policy becomes totally effective.

While the minister says that the purchasing policy is effective immediately and will be implemented as quickly as possible, there are an awful lot of things in this statement that yet have to be done, such as building a list of goods and services, establishing and maintaining minimal acceptable specifications, building a list of suppliers and establishing and maintaining collective purchasing agreements.

All of the preparation could have been done over the last five years that this government has been in office. They are very slow in getting around to doing this and I regret that, having finally got around to doing it, they have not included in the statement any

specific target. We do not know from the minister's statement today how much waste is going to be reduced by this policy. We do not know the time frame within which he hopes to reach a certain target.

This is a voluntary action on the part of the government. We in this party agree that voluntary actions to reduce waste are necessary, but we also feel that it is essential to put in place a regulatory framework so that all agencies, businesses and industries will be required to reduce waste. We sincerely regret that this government refuses to put in place that framework and seems to be relying entirely on voluntary participation. Not everyone perhaps will be as environmentally sensitive as the Minister of Government Services. I am glad today that he at least is.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

Mr Eves: I would like to rise and join in commending the St John Ambulance society which has worked very hard in this province for over 100 years, and I would like to join with the minister and the member for Riverdale in extending our commendation to it.

It is always a dangerous thing to do, I can see, agreeing with the member for Riverdale, but I think that his advice to the Minister of Health is well taken on this occasion and that perhaps she should spend her time in ministerial statements in the next few days addressing the very real problems of the Ajax and Pickering hospital and also addressing the problems of some other volunteer organizations, such as the Red Cross and the Victorian Order of Nurses, that have to come to the minister on bended knee every year to ask her to bail them out so that they will not go bankrupt, so that they will not have to stop delivering their services; if the minister would kindly address their budget problems once and for all.

1410

ENVIRONMENTAL PURCHASING POLICY

Mr J. M. Johnson: I would like to congratulate the Minister of Government Services in taking this initiative and suggest, as the member from the opposition has suggested, that the government should have been doing it for years.

I am a little puzzled at the comment in the second section where the minister says, "To provide a role model for the broader public and private sectors, supplies, equipment and services purchased by our government will now support the 3Rs of waste management—reduction, reuse and recycling." Why not now? This is rather late to be starting. I guess it is better late than never, but the government should have been working at it.

On his first page, the minister says, "Each year, the Ontario government purchases more than \$2 billion worth of goods and services." That certainly represents an enormous, as he calls it, purchasing muscle, but it also represents a lot of spending. Maybe he should take into consideration the first R of reduction and not spend so much money and not buy so many services that use resources.

The minister sent over the news release and he also sent four pages to go along with it. Maybe he could emphasize reduction, and that would solve some of the problem. Anyway, he is to be congratulated for doing something even now, and certainly the 11,500 government coffee mugs will be of some benefit to employees. Maybe he could send them to the 130 members as well.

Mrs Marland: I would be more impressed had this statement been on recycled paper. It does not say it is on recycled paper, so I have to assume it is not.

The one thing I would like to say to the minister on this subject is that this paper is imperial. I understand that the government has now thrown out the requirement for metric. Is that correct? There are a lot of trays all around the constituency offices and government offices in this province, which all converted to metric, and now we are back to Imperial. I think it has been an interesting exercise and one which obviously the minister has done with some wisdom and without any fanfare, because nobody has heard about it officially.

I think that perhaps, Minister, when you get an opportunity to speak later on this afternoon, you might like to hold up the mug that I saw sitting on your desk. I recognize that in the speech you were supposed to say, "These recycled glass coffee mugs," and I am sure you were supposed to hold it up. I am just helping you out here because—

The Deputy Speaker: The member will address the Speaker, please.

Mrs Marland: Sorry, Mr Speaker. I thought the minister would not want to miss that opportunity.

From the standpoint that I attended a three-day meeting in Washington as one of two representatives of this province at a North American meeting on the subject of the environment, I think it is very significant that this government is just now looking at energy-saving lightbulbs. We had a very enlightened presentation by the government officials in Washington who now are demonstrating the use of energy-saving lightbulbs. I am glad that if this government cannot lead, at least it can follow.

I also want to say, on the idea of collecting food waste from the government cafeteria and selling it as livestock feed, perhaps that is chicken feed at best. But I also hope that the Premier will get an opportunity to say that he really was not serious when I said that I was going to start eating everything so it would not be wasted and he said that he thought I ate everything now. I would like to tell the Premier that I am now a prime star candidate on the Nutri System, so he will not be able to say that much longer.

ORAL QUESTIONS

SOLID WASTE REDUCTION

Mrs Grier: My question is for the Minister of the Environment and it concerns waste reduction. I regret that the minister was not here to hear me applaud his colleague the Minister of Government Services on taking at least a step towards waste reduction. I am sure the minister is aware that in a Gallup poll published today, 85 per cent of the population does not think that governments are doing enough to ensure a clean environment and I am sure he knows that high on the list of concerns is the whole question of what is to be done about our garbage.

This House last December supported unanimously a resolution of mine calling on the government to get serious about waste reduction. On 17 May again all parties supported a private member's bill, the member for Hamilton West's, putting into practice the tone of that resolution of last December. But when I asked the minister on 17 May whether he would support regulations to reduce garbage, he replied that he found it a little difficult, when there is voluntary action, to come in with a sledgehammer and hit people over the head and say, "Now you have to do this, you have to do that."

Does the minister really believe that voluntary action is going to be successful in reaching the target he has set himself of reducing by 25% the total garbage going to landfill and incineration by the end of 1992? What assurance can he give us that voluntary action will reach that target?

Hon Mr Bradley: What we have seen in Ontario in terms of the response that people have had to various programs which

have been designed to divert waste from either incineration or landfill is rather phenomenal. We have seen the kind of response that many people would not have predicted in terms of public participation in these efforts. Many of them have originated from individual groups and organizations within communities and some of them within the municipal councils themselves, and they are having a very significant impact on the amount of material that would go to either landfill or incineration in this province.

It is difficult. I know the member would like to regulate, and there are times when one has to regulate, but with the financial incentives that this government has put out for municipalities and for others to participate in reduction, reuse and recycling in this province, I think we are really going to achieve this. As I have said on numerous occasions in the House, many other jurisdictions are looking at what we are doing in Ontario with a view to emulating it because they see how successful it is.

The member is familiar enough with the environmental scene—I know she has been concerned about it for a number of years, as a municipal councillor and now as a provincial member—to know that if one talks to people in schools and people in various service clubs and organizations, all of them are making efforts to contribute to a solution to this problem. I certainly commend the people of Ontario for doing so.

Mrs Grier: The minister is at best guilty of painting an overly rosy picture of the situation. I agree that there has been a phenomenal response from individuals who want to reduce the amount of garbage, but there has not been a phenomenal response from industry and business. I do not share the minister's conclusion that the response from individuals has had a significant impact on the amount of garbage going to landfills.

Let me show the minister graphically if he does not quite get the words that I sometimes use. The minister's target is 25% reduction by the end of 1992, and 2% is what the minister's voluntary effort has achieved. We are now one and a half years into the minister's four-year program of reaching 25% reduction. How is he going to get from here to there using voluntary effort?

Hon Mr Bradley: I never use this word in the House because I am not one who does, but the socialist approach to things, which is overly regulated—I know the Conservative Party would find that attractive perhaps—is constant regulation and telling people what they must do. We see an evolution away from that around the world. In various jurisdictions we see people moving away from that to areas where we see some enthusiastic response to incentives that are put out there.

Mr Wildman: Why do you let Nixon stomp on you like that?

Hon Mr Bradley: Let me tell the member for Algoma, for instance, that we have two million households in Ontario that are on the blue box program. We have already achieved that and it is increasing all the time. We have already achieved at least a 14% diversion of waste in terms of the household waste we see.

The member will be aware that the new thing that is really taking off in Ontario, again on a voluntary basis, is composting: either a community effort or individual efforts on composting. This is working some rather significant reductions. In addition to that, through our industrial 3Rs program we provide incentives, suggestions and technical assistance to people in the business, commercial and industrial fields who are attempting to reduce, reuse and recycle. That is beginning to have a substantial impact and will grow like a snowball this year.

1420

Mrs Grier: When the minister falls back on saying that regulation equals socialism equals something his government would not do, I think it shows how devoid of policies this minister is. We can say to people, "Don't park on a certain

street." If we find it does not work, we put a regulation to make sure that desirable social objective is achieved.

What the minister is admitting, and what I want him to admit, is that with the target he has set himself—it is not my target, it is his target, 25% reduction by 1992—he has no clear and specific policies that will get him to that target. I want to know, in addition, whether he has contingency plans so that when he has not reached the target by 1992, he will then begin to regulate. Is he preparing those contingency plans?

Hon Mr Bradley: Once again, the member is dwelling very heavily in this specific area of regulation. Certainly she and I would agree. I would not quarrel with her on the parking situation that she mentioned and the need to regulate in that regard.

I think, though, to be hypothetical, if you had a situation where people voluntarily did not violate that and were enthusiastically not violating that, then of course you would not have to regulate. There are instances where people are really enthusiastic about this, and I actually believe this is going to work. I am much more confident that the people of Ontario are prepared to respond in this way on this basis with enthusiasm than the member is. I have a lot of confidence in the people out there.

I know there are people in the business field, for instance, who are making a good business now out of the 3Rs, who are being very innovative, who are investing many thousands upon thousands of dollars in this particular business. We are seeing a reduction taking place, we are seeing a lot of reuse and we are seeing a lot of recycling. I wish the member would be as enthusiastic as the people of this province in this regard.

DEREGULATION OF TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr D. S. Cooke: I have a question to the Minister of Transportation, regarding his efforts last week to completely pass the buck to the federal government on his responsibility and the responsibility of the provincial government for the problems the truckers are experiencing in this province and across the nation.

A few years ago his government said, when the national government was negotiating free trade, that one-sided free trade would be totally unfair and would result in lost jobs in Ontario. Is it not true that through the deregulation of the trucking industry at the provincial level by his government, truckers lost protection and that jobs have been lost to the United States, and that is one of the bottom causes of last week's demonstration?

Hon Mr Wrye: No.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I think people across this province know better than that. We saw the efforts by this government a couple of years ago. Publicly they said they were opposed to free trade, but here in the Legislature they threw up their hands and they could not get the deregulation bills on trucking passed quickly enough.

Our critic at the time, the member for Sault Ste Marie, predicted exactly what was going to happen. "The bill's key test," he said in the Legislature, "was a proposal to replace the present entry test in the Ontario trucking business from an examination of the need for additional services to an examination of the fitness of the applicant." In other words, even if we did not need the competition in trucking, we got it in Ontario.

The minister knows there is a double standard as well. Truckers here in Ontario who go to the United States are not facing deregulation in every state; it has not been done state by state. Therefore we have to play by one set of rules over there, and the truckers who come here to Ontario play by a completely wide-open system.

The minister promised action. Is he prepared to revoke his deregulation bill so that our truckers are protected?

Hon Mr Wrye: What I am prepared to do and what we have been doing is continuing to lobby both at the federal level and at the state level for the kind of level playing field that I think all members of the House want. As recently as a week ago, my senior officials met with senior officials in the state of Michigan and raised once again the fact that the liberalization of the regulatory environment in Michigan, while welcome, does not go far enough. As well, we have continued to discuss these matters with the federal government.

But my honourable friend, I think, would want to acknowledge, and I would have thought would have been the first to acknowledge, the significance of the federal involvement in all of this. I just want to read, if I might, a short section of an article in last week's Windsor Star, which obviously my good friend the member for Windsor-Riverside missed. It is about Bill Bondy, the owner of Bondy Freight Lines. My friend will know Bill quite well.

He said: "The issues raised by the truckers leave out the real problem with the Canadian industry—the value of the Canadian dollar. A strong dollar coupled with deregulation to cripple the industry....

"'Unless the dollar drops to levels of the mid-70s, the industry will continue to suffer,' Bondy said."

Mr Pouliot: What about the gas tax?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Wrye: That combined with high interest rates, combined with the huge spread in the Canadian and American interest rates, and not the issues my friend raises, are the real issues in this matter.

Mr Farnan: This government has cosied up to Mulroney on free trade, on the goods and services tax and now on the trucking industry. Reports indicate that 5,000 jobs have been lost in the last 18 months. David Bradley, the vice-president of the Ontario Trucking Association, guesstimates that this could be 12,000 jobs by the end of this year. We are losing Canadian jobs and Canadian companies to the United States.

What assurance will the minister give to the Waterloo region, one of the most significant centres of the trucking industry in this province, and what assurance will he give to the province as a whole, that he will not continue to sacrifice jobs in the trucking industry by his continuing cosyng up to the Mulroney government?

Hon Mr Wrye: I am always amused when I hear from that side comments about cosyng up to the Mulroney government on free trade. I always try to reflect back to those days in 1988 when we waited for Ed to speak out on free trade. We waited and we waited, but nothing ever happened.

The honourable member would want to know that this government has recognized, notwithstanding that many of the issues are federal, the importance of the jobs that are being lost. Indeed, under the direction of the Premier, we set up a trucking industry adjustment committee over a month ago on which Mr Bradley sits.

I note that an editorial last week, and I am sure my friend the member for Cambridge would not have seen it, said: "So far, only the Ontario government has recognized these high stakes. The province has already formed a trucking industry adjustment committee, including representatives of the industry and government, to examine the problems."

So we are taking action to see what can be done in this jurisdiction and to press the federal government to improve the economic situation and the economic climate for truckers in the province.

CONSTITUTIONAL ACCORD

Mr Harris: I am troubled that the Premier either was not or did not feel that he was in a position to report today on his talks with the Prime Minister over the weekend.

The Deputy Speaker: To whom is your question addressed?

Mr Harris: Given the seriousness of the constitutional crisis, Premier, I believe Ontario must provide clear, united, non-partisan leadership to help resolve it—

Mr Ballinger: What do you think we have been doing for the last six months?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Harris: —and I have only one question for the Premier today. There are three party leaders representing 130 members of this Legislature, all of whom love the nation, all of whom want to work to ensure that it remains strong and united after 23 June. I believe it is imperative that all three party leaders meet immediately to enable Ontario to speak with that strong, united, non-partisan voice. Will the Premier convene immediately a meeting of the three party leaders to see if we can work together on that?

Hon Mr Peterson: The answer is that I would be very happy, if the member would like, to meet and I could bring him up to date on what is happening. As he knows, there are a number of meetings the Prime Minister has convened with the premiers to try to determine where the common ground is. If my honourable friend is interested, I think I can tell him more where I think the differences exist at the present time.

The strategy in dealing with this is in the hands of the Prime Minister at the present time. He chose to have this series of meetings with the premiers. It is a distinct likelihood, I suspect, although I cannot speak with authority on this matter, that there will be a meeting of the first ministers in the not-too-distant future to finally resolve the question.

I know my honourable friend has more supplementaries and I would be happy to respond to those, because there are lots of things I would be happy to share with him.

1430

Mr Harris: Thank you, Premier. I do have the opportunity for supplementaries. I actually was hoping that it would not be necessary.

I truly believe it is important that we meet on this issue. I suggest to him that I do not think this is the time to dredge up all our solutions over the last three years; I think we are beyond that now and I think he would agree with that. He obviously did not feel that it was appropriate to share, by way of statement, the discussions. I accept his view on that and I do not question that.

However, in view of that, I would think it is important that we meet immediately. I tell him that I am prepared to clear my schedule today; I am prepared to leave right now to start those discussions. I am sure the leader of the New Democratic Party, who I understand is in Ottawa today, would be prepared to join us at the earliest possible time. I understand that would be this evening. Should the Premier wish to wait until this evening, I would be prepared to do that if he feels the three of us should be together for the first meeting. I just do not believe that we have any time to waste in this Legislature and I am offering that in a very non-partisan way on behalf of my caucus.

Hon Mr Peterson: I would be happy to meet with the honourable member and the Leader of the Opposition as well. As the member knows, the resolution to this matter will not be among the three of us; it is going to be among the various provinces which have different views on this question at the present time.

I repeat what I said earlier to my honourable friend: I think they are narrower than most people would imagine in this circumstance, particularly on the question of the Senate veto and on the question of the distinct society. I have not had any reports as of this moment on the meeting of Mr Bourassa and Mr Mulroney. I still think there is some flexibility in the system, but it is not going to be easy. I agree with my honourable friend that there is not a lot of time in which to resolve this question.

One of the things that has characterized the debate in this province is that in this House I think there has been, with very few exceptions, a great deal of commitment to this country and great sensitivity for the other regions and the other provinces—Quebec, but the other regions as well. I think that overwhelmingly at the top of everyone's personal and political agenda has been how to build a stronger and more united Canada. It has not been an easy debate; it is not an easy debate for any one of us. It has been divisive, it has been tough on a number of parties, particularly our party and the New Democratic Party; perhaps less so on the member's, even though there are divisions. We understand that.

But this is probably as important a debate as we will ever be involved in in our whole political lives. I do not want to be overly dramatic, but I believe that the decisions that are made by the first ministers—and the legislatures, because it is all of us together—will probably have more influence on the future course of our country than, shall we say, the ordinary debates in which we are involved.

I welcome my honourable friend's ideas or suggestions. I am sure he probably has a number of contacts across the country and friends with whom he could talk and try to persuade that, in the final analysis, we have to put the national interest at the top of every single person's agenda. We also know that it is going to take some reach, it is going to take some accommodation and an enormous amount of sensitivity. But I would be very happy to meet with my honourable friend if he would like to discuss the matter, and certainly when the Leader of the Opposition is here perhaps the three of us can sit down and think through the matter.

Mr Harris: I agree with the Premier: I do not believe there is anything more important that I see on the horizon that we as political leaders in this province can be involved in. So I assure him that is foremost on my agenda. As I said, we are prepared to clear our schedules completely. I commend the Premier for agreeing to the suggestion and I indicate to him that I have not been able to have discussions this morning with the leader of the New Democratic Party. I would encourage the Premier to do that. I indicate that I do believe it is important that he, as Premier of this province, is able to speak with a unified, strong, non-partisan voice while representing all 130 of us. I am prepared today, right now or as soon as possible, to work towards that.

Hon Mr Peterson: I appreciate the constructive view of my friend opposite, and may I say that I enjoyed that relationship of trust with his predecessor, the member for Sarnia. I did take him into my confidence on a number of occasions, and it was a confidence extremely well placed, just as I have done with the Leader of the Opposition in the past.

I agree with my honourable friend. It is important. Because Ontario is the largest province, I think it behooves us to be as sensitive as we can to the others, to try to speak with a united voice. May I just say in a very personal way that I have always felt that I had the confidence of my colleagues in this enormously complicated debate, because I know at the end of the day of the enormous generosity of all the members of this House and how much they love their country.

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr Eves: My question is to the Minister of Health. The minister undoubtedly will be aware that Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a chronic care facility in the city of Toronto, estimates that it will have to close some 50 beds next month due to the limitations put on its funding as a result of the Treasurer's budget on 24 April. Despite the fact that they were promised 100 new chronic care beds in the minister's announcement of May 1986, and despite the fact that they have over 1,200 people on their waiting list for chronic care beds, they may in fact have to close an additional 50 beds. How can the minister justify a situation in the province where a chronic care hospital such as Queen Elizabeth is faced with closing 50 beds when it has 1,200 people on its waiting list?

Hon Mrs Caplan: The member, I am sure, will remember the discussion that we had in this House last year around this time, and through the course of last year, when we acknowledged that, as part of a traditional approach to hospital funding, during a transitional time there were some special challenges being faced by the chronic care hospitals in the province, that the ministry was very responsive to this and was working with the hospitals to resolve those issues during this transitional time. I would tell him that we have not received a budget plan and proposal; however, we are expecting to do so shortly, and we will be monitoring this situation and working with the hospitals to resolve their issues.

Mr Eves: Officials from that hospital, and in fact from the Ontario Hospital Association, estimate that there are about 3,000 people on the waiting list for chronic care beds in Metropolitan Toronto.

We also have seen the situation very recently with elderly and chronic care patients at the Ajax and Pickering General Hospital, another hospital that the minister promised 70 new chronic care beds to, on 14 May 1986. Included in those expansion plans were shower stalls. These people are now being hosed down in a closet that is used to store maintenance supplies. That is the way that the elderly and chronic care patients in our province are being treated. Does the minister agree with that treatment? How can she justify that over four years after she made these commitments for these new chronic care beds?

Hon Mrs Caplan: The situation that the member refers to is clearly unacceptable. In response to a question from the member for Durham West just a few weeks ago, I identified Ajax-Pickering hospital as a priority not only for the region, as identified by the district health council, but for the ministry as well. I am pleased to tell the member that in fact the ministry officials met with the hospital as early as last Friday and that we expect the matter to reach conclusion of the planning process and an announcement to be made within a very few weeks.

Mr Eves: This construction, according to the hospital spokespeople she is talking about, whom she recently met with, was supposed to start in November 1989. They claim it is the ministry dragging its feet at every step of every approval process for the last four-plus years, that this is the reason why these people are still being showered with a hose in a maintenance closet. I do not find that acceptable. A nurse who has worked there for some 17 years says it happens every day. I find it very undignified that we have to treat people this way. Where has the minister been for the last four years, why did she not meet her November 1989 deadline and why are these people not being treated in a more humane manner four years later?

1440

Hon Mrs Caplan: I would say to the member opposite that I think he is aware, as I am, that one of our priorities is both the comfort and the convenience of patients in the hospitals across

the province. As an important part of our capital planning framework, we have identified infrastructure renewal and an opportunity to respond not only to the occupational health and safety issues, but to the comfort and convenience of patients.

I would say to him that the ministry officials have met with the hospital officials. We have been working diligently on this since March 1990. The Durham district health council is very much involved, and in fact there has been an agreement to do everything we can to fast-track this process since Durham is part of a region in this province which is experiencing rapid growth, has a very young population and experiences some special challenges.

DISTRICT HEALTH COUNCILS

Mr Hampton: My question is for the Minister of Health as well. On several occasions in this House when the minister has been asked about the funding of particular health care proposals for particular communities, she has responded that district health councils rank priorities and forward them to the ministry and the ministry then funds the priorities that have been identified by the health councils.

How does the minister explain that the district health council for Kenora-Rainy River has ranked an intensive care unit for the hospital in Fort Frances as a number one priority for the last two years, her ministry has refused to fund it, and yet other projects that were well down on the list—and some of them not on the list—have been funded? How does she explain it when the district health council ranks a priority for her, puts it as number one, her ministry ignores it, and yet she tells us in here time after time that the way to go, the way to proceed, is through the district health council, "Put your proposal to them, have it ranked, and then it will be funded"?

Hon Mrs Caplan: In fact, I am very aware of the situation in Kenora; my colleague the member for Kenora has been very diligent in making sure that I am aware of the situation. I want to say to the honourable member that the district health councils have been undergoing a renewal of their mandate and that the ministry has established areas of provincial priority. We have been working very closely with the district health councils in areas such as dialysis. In fact, we have seen tremendous expansion of services in the Kenora area. In other areas of priority we have moved forward, and we continue to consult with the district health councils to provide us with helpful advice as we move forward to ensure that the people of northern Ontario and right across this province receive the most appropriate care.

Mr Hampton: One of the doctors who sits on the Kenora-Rainy River health council had this to say about the ministry's work. He said, "In northwestern Ontario the government is funding its political priorities while the real health care needs, as identified by the district health council, are ignored." That is what the doctors who sit on the health councils have to say.

Let me give the minister an example. In 1979 the hospital in Dryden submitted a proposal for the redevelopment of that hospital. In 1984 funding was received for the phase 1 development, but since then the minister has ignored that hospital. She has placed them on hold, with a population of 15,000 and growing. At the same time that she has ignored them she has funded other projects that have not in any way been recommended or, if they were recommended by the district health council, have been well down on the list. How does the minister justify that? She says the system is rational.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Mr Hampton: How does she justify that when the health councils do not recommend these projects and she funds them and others do not get funded?

The Deputy Speaker: The question has been asked.

Hon Mrs Caplan: The member opposite is not only incorrect; he is absolutely wrong in the approach that he has taken. We have a capital framework which has been applauded by all of our partners in health care across this province as a rational and important approach to capital funding. We have established priorities in the areas of innovation, specialty care and infrastructure renewal as well as meeting the demographic changes of this province. I can tell him that we seek advice from district health councils and that we have moved in a manner which is consistent and fair, and is seen to be consistent and fair, as we meet the needs of the people of this province.

GREATER TORONTO AREA RAPID TRANSIT

Mr Cousens: I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. Like many people, I am looking forward to Toronto being the host city for Expo 2000 and for the 1996 Olympics. Time is rapidly approaching. In 17 days we will learn where the host city will be for Expo 2000. In 113 days, we hope to learn that Toronto is the chosen site for the Olympics. How involved has the minister or his ministry been in supporting these bids, and what specific action is he committing to undertake to help make it happen?

Hon Mr Wrye: I thought I heard the honourable member's statement earlier today, and right within that statement was an indication of the kind of commitment that I have put forward on behalf of the government. I think a commitment of a \$5-billion improvement to the public transportation system in every part of the greater Toronto area is a commitment which is quite unprecedented, not only anywhere in Canada but anywhere in North America. That is a firm commitment on the part of the government.

The implementation committee, as the honourable member knows, is moving forward and is working very well together. I expect that by the fall we will have a game plan in place for the staging of all of those projects. In the meantime, I can advise the honourable member that on a number of these projects the preliminary work is already under way so that from the time the implementation committee reports there will be no undue holdups in getting the projects under way, because, as my friend says, many of them will have to be ready for 1996.

Mr Cousens: It is the undue holdups that keep worrying us. Typical of the concerns that people are having in and around the greater Toronto area, is a cartoon in our local media this weekend having to do with road improvements which shows a picture of the minister made up as a turtle, and then the driver is dressed as sort of a rabbit. It could be any one of us there, really quite angry. But the minister is the turtle. Everyone else is in a hurry to get something happening, and the old rabbit says, "Would you please get a move on?" Compliments of A. Mair of the Markham Economist and Sun.

Mr Neumann: You know who won the race, don't you?

Mr Cousens: I am not a turtle. If the member really wants to talk about being turtles, he should stop talking about my haircut.

I think there is something going on around here. Words are cheap. Here is the minister who is going along saying, "Well, something's happening." We want to know what is happening. We want to see the Olympics come. We want to see that Expo 2000 is a success. We know that they are important events for Ontario and we want to see that there is a significant amount of weight and importance from the minister and his ministry to help make it happen. What commitment is the minister prepared to make to make it happen in time for the people to enjoy the roads and services they desperately need?

Hon Mr Wrye: I noted from the cartoon, if I could see across the aisle, that the turtle was still ahead. At the end of the day, I say to my friend, it was the turtle who won the race. I have been called worse.

I can only say to the honourable member—and I know his great concern about the matter—that we have a very, very ambitious agenda. We are, as of today, on target with that agenda. We will be able to move forward in dramatic fashion, in a fashion never before seen, certainly in Ontario, never before seen in North America, to put in place the finest rapid transit system anywhere on the continent. That will demand the co-operation of everyone in the months and indeed in the years to come.

I can say to the honourable member that I have been extremely encouraged by the tone of the early discussions of the transit implementation committee, by the willingness of all of the partners on that implementation committee to get on with the job, and I expect that to continue.

TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr M. C. Ray: I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The minister will know that the city council of Windsor recently approved the site plan for the proposed new Ontario government tourist centre in downtown Windsor at the Detroit-Windsor tunnel exit. Could the minister advise when construction will begin on this project which has been delayed now for over three years?

Hon Mr Black: I am pleased to respond to the member because I know of his ongoing interest in the tourist information centre in Windsor. That interest began when he was a councillor in the city of Windsor and it has been ongoing and supportive ever since.

I want to say to the member that I was pleased, as he was, to know that the Windsor city council has in fact approved the site plan. We are pleased that a spirit of co-operation is in place and we are working together now. I will be consulting with my colleague the Minister of Government Services in the next few days to see how quickly we can move this project forward.

Mr M. C. Ray: "In the next few days" is the surprise. I thought that there had already been serious consultation between the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and the Minister of Government Services. Do we have the assurance of the minister that he will do everything in his power to impress upon his colleague and his other colleagues in cabinet the importance of this project, not only for Windsor-area tourism, but also for tourism generally in this province because this is a major port of entry to Canada for millions of automobile passenger tourists in this province?

1450

Hon Mr Black: I want to say first of all to the member that there has indeed been ongoing consultation, as he would know, with several ministries of this government in an attempt to move that project forward. However, we were not able to make that happen until such time as the city of Windsor had in fact approved the site plan. Now that has happened, we will be renewing our efforts to bring the project to fruition.

I also want to say to him and to all members of this House that we are very conscious of the important role that Windsor plays in terms of being an entry point for visitors from the United States to Ontario. We are very anxious that this project should proceed and we are going to be working to make sure it happens at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I am sure we will get the tourist centre at the same time we get the courthouse and the hospital the Liberals promised, during the election.

RENT REGULATION

Mr D. S. Cooke: I have a question to the Minister of Housing. The minister will be aware of the buildings that have been mentioned in questions in the Legislature twice now, the Parkdale buildings at 96, 109 and 166 Jameson Avenue. The tenants in those building went to court. They received a temporary injunction to stop the unnecessary luxury renovations, but the injunction was a temporary injunction. They now have to go back to Toronto city council and ask for \$50,000 to put down as a bond to get a permanent injunction.

Is that the kind of rent review system and protection of tenants that the minister supports, where tenants have to go to city council and, out of property tax dollars, get the financing to protect themselves because Liberal rent review legislation is so weak and ineffective?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I would obviously disagree with the editorial comment by my colleague that our legislation is weak and ineffective. I think the facts clearly point out that it is very effective for a very, very large number of tenants in this province. The honourable member will also be aware of the fact that an application has been made for a rent increase but no rent increase has yet been granted.

Mr D. S. Cooke: The fact of the matter is that the landlord is replacing appliances, making major renovations, walking into units without the approval of tenants when they are not home, carrying out major renovations that have not been approved by the tenants and will go to rent review. The minister knows that as well as I do. The only option the tenants have had is to go to court and get an injunction, because this government's rent review legislation does not protect them.

What is the minister prepared to do? If he is not prepared to change the rent review legislation, as we have suggested and the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations has suggested, is he at least prepared to bring in a program that will properly finance tenants so that it will not be on a matter of whether they can afford it or not but every tenant across the province will have access to the courts for the protection, because obviously the minister is not providing the protection?

Hon Mr Sweeney: My honourable friend is well aware of the fact that under the landlord and tenant legislation, for which the Attorney General is responsible, there is a prohibition from landlords simply walking into a tenant's suite, as he says, any time they feel like it. This has to be an agreement between the landlord and the tenant as to when they can go in. There are remedies under the legislation to deal with that particular situation.

DRUG BENEFITS

Mr Villeneuve: To the Minister of Health, Mr Speaker. I wrote the minister about a year ago concerning a kidney transplant patient in my riding having serious trouble paying for his drugs on his part-time job—over a year ago, and nothing has been done. What is the policy of this government, to force people into welfare to get adequate drug treatment coverage? Is that this government's policy?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I think the member knows that the Ontario drug benefit program provides prescription drugs to people over the age of 65 and those in financial need and receiving social assistance from the province. He knows as well that there are some particular programs that this government has announced in the area of cystic fibrosis and thalassemia. As well, all drugs provided on an inpatient basis within the hospitals are presently funded.

We are always reviewing the drug benefit program to determine how it can be improved. We established the Lowy drug inquiry. I expect to have those recommendations in very short order, but at the present time he should know that there is no universal approach to all drugs in this province and anyone on an individual case-by-case basis who has problems can apply to the Ministry of Community and Social Services for assistance.

Mr Villeneuve: Even though a transplant followed by treatment is much cheaper and preferable to the use of a dialysis machine, this patient still has to pay a very excessive amount of money to cover his drug costs. The Lowy inquiry made recommendations to the minister over a year ago. We cannot use that as an excuse any more. My constituent needs a real answer. Because he is a kidney transplant patient and needs heavy, heavy medication, can the minister confirm today that she will provide support to these particular patients, kidney transplant patients?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I can tell the member opposite that if his constituent meets the criteria of Comsoc for financial social assistance, that financial assistance is available so that no one in financial need is denied access to the drugs. At the present time, the criteria for the Ontario drug benefit program are for those people over the age of 65 and those who are receiving financial social assistance benefits in the province. With the few exceptions that I mentioned around some drugs available in special disease cases through hospital programming, I can tell him that that is the situation that exists today.

LAND REGISTRATION

Mr Tatham: My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and concerns the province of Ontario land registry information system, better known as Polaris. As the minister will know, there has been a Polaris pilot project up and running in Oxford county for some time. In his answers to previous questions raised by myself and others in this place, the minister has informed us of the progress of the government in bringing this important technological advance on stream province-wide. Will the minister tell the House whether his ministry has yet been able to negotiate an agreement with those who will be working in partnership with the province to bring this project to reality, and, if not, why not, and when he thinks he will finally be successful?

Hon Mr Sorbara: Actually, I have some very good news for my friend, as he knows, because he is very interested in this question. My friend from Oxford has in fact helped me to understand Polaris more directly by conducting a tour of pilot projects that we have down in the Woodstock area.

Very recently, we have entered into negotiations with Real-Data Ontario, known as RDO.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Sorbara: That was after careful scrutiny, the most careful of scrutiny, between two proposals, one from Real-Data Ontario and another from its competitor. After careful scrutiny, we have chosen Real-Data Ontario as the negotiating partner and we expect that within a few weeks a detailed agreement will be reached, so progress, very important progress, is being made.

Mr Tatham: The Polaris pilot project in Oxford county has shown just what sort of potential this technology holds for the municipalities of this province. One of the concerns that has repeatedly been drawn to the minister's attention concerns the ultimate availability of this information and technology to the municipalities. By way of supplementary, would the minister please tell the House what specific plans he has for ensuring that the sort of co-operation that has existed between his ministry and

Oxford county will in fact be passed on to other municipalities once the private sector partners are involved?

Hon Mr Sorbara: My friend from Oxford has hit on a very important aspect of this strategic alliance; that is, the alliance between my own ministry's land registration division and a private sector partner which will join forces with the ministry and actually create the database so that we can have a databased land registration system far more quickly than were we to do it alone.

The availability of that sort of information to municipalities forms one of the cornerstones of the agreement that we will be negotiating. Obviously, our responsibility is to make sure that all those users of this sort of data utility have access to the information contained in the data utility and they have access to it at a reasonable cost. The municipalities will be one of the prime users of that information, and we are going to make sure as we design not only the computer programs but the delivery of those data that they will be available to them at a cost that is reasonable.

1500

PAY EQUITY

Mr Allen: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. I have asked the minister several questions about the continuing bad record of his government and ministry with regard to pay equity settlements relating to community-based agencies, particularly in the context of divestment of a service from government-sponsored to community-based operations.

Once again an institution for the developmentally handicapped, the Prince Edward Heights institution, is being divested. The staff is in the first stage of pay equity, as the minister may know, and if the pay equity settlement is not followed by the new board, the salary gap between the equivalent government workers and those in the new community agency will leap from around 20% to slightly over 30%, something contrary to policy that the minister has been trying to implement regarding that very gap problem.

Why is the minister not prepared to assure these workers, under the Crown Agency Act, which provides for such things, that all their benefits, rights and privileges, including the pay equity settlement, will be honoured by the new board?

Hon Mr Beer: As the honourable member is perhaps aware with regard to that transfer, in working both with the new agency and those who had been working at the existing facility we have said that their various rights and privileges would be respected. The actual terms of that will be worked out in the first contract, but certainly we have an interest to ensure that in fact they are treated fairly and properly and are remunerated at the levels they are currently receiving.

Mr Allen: The minister speaks in terms of fairness, and yet he seems to speak continually on this subject with a forked tongue.

Let's shift the scene, for example, to Frontenac-Kingston and the children's aid society there, where he is in breach of the Pay Equity Act. The Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal has ruled that the government is the employer of the CAS staff in that place and that the minister must complete a pay equity settlement with that staff. Once more, he is running away from his own legislation, not only refusing to negotiate pay equity in its completeness but challenging the tribunal's decision and refusing to pay the amount ordered by the tribunal while the challenge is heard, as required by the act. Why will the government, as the funder of these agencies, not acknowledge that it is the de facto employer and follow the requirements of its own pay equity legislation?

Hon Mr Beer: As the honourable member would know, in terms of the question of the employer, we have community-based boards and agencies which in fact look after the dealings of those

various societies or agencies. In our view, we fund those agencies, which then in turn set up their own policies with respect to the individuals whom they would hire. It is for that reason we are reviewing the situation. As the honourable member knows, that is currently being discussed and is on appeal. We feel that it is important to maintain that community element to the direction of these boards and agencies and that they in fact are the employer of record.

INVESTIGATION INTO MUNICIPAL ELECTION

Mr Sterling: I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he is involved in the investigation of Mayor Jim Durrell, who is the mayor of the city of Ottawa. There are allegations of his breaching the Municipal Elections Act and I wonder whether the Solicitor General or the OPP are involved in the investigation of those matters.

Hon Mr Offer: It is a matter which I am not aware of but certainly will look into and report back on.

Mr Sterling: As the Solicitor General knows, Mayor Durrell happens to be a commissioner of the Ottawa police, which is undertaking an investigation of this matter. Does he think it is right and proper that the police should be examining or investigating an alleged breach of the law by one of the commissioners of that very same force?

Hon Mr Offer: I cannot comment specifically on the issue, as I have undertaken to provide that information to the member and report back, but in dealing with investigations generally I think we would all recognize that it is both right and proper for police officers to be involved in any investigation of any matter for which it is their responsibility to so investigate, and to act accordingly.

DRIVERS' LICENCES

Ms Poole: My question is for the Minister of Transportation. On Saturday the Toronto Star carried a story stating that the Ontario government is considering a plan to raise the minimum age for licensed drivers to 18 from 16. As a member of the government, I was quite surprised to hear this. According to the Star, under this proposal 16-year-olds still could get a driver's licence as far as a learner's permit is concerned, but they would be severely restricted. I would like to ask the minister whether this story is indeed true.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Wrye: I can tell the honourable member that my eyebrows raised just a touch as I read the article in Saturday's Star. I believe in answer to a question earlier from my colleague from Nepean I indicated that we had no plans to raise the driving age from 16 to 18, but rather that we were taking a look at and had plans to introduce a form of graduated driver's licence such as is in place in states such as Maryland and California. That is still the plan and we are currently reviewing the options that are available to us in terms of the graduated driver's licence.

Ms Poole: I am certain my 15-year-old son, who will be reaching that magic age next year, will be delighted to hear that. I am not sure I am, but he certainly will be.

The other part of the article that surprised me was that an assistant deputy transport minister had said that inexperienced drivers, young drivers, usually still in their teens, are greatly overrepresented in our accident statistics. I am unaware of any study which shows the difference in accident statistics from a 16-year-old as opposed to an 18-year-old. I wonder if the minister would enlighten me whether any such study exists.

Hon Mr Wrye: Each year we compile statistics, very detailed statistics involving all accidents in Ontario, and one of the factors we look at is age. I can share with the honourable member a very discouraging statistic that shows that one out of every six persons who is licensed at the age of 16 will have an accident at the age of 16. That number in the middle-age bracket drops as low as one out of every 20. Very clearly, those statistics are somewhat alarming and very discouraging.

It has been the experience of other jurisdictions that by putting in place a driving licence which is somewhat limited in its application, the so-called graduated driver's licence, which may limit the right of younger drivers in their first years to drive at certain times of day or with numbers of people or on certain roads, those statistics can be improved in a range of 10% to 15%. I think all members of the House would want to see that kind of improvement. Indeed, the honourable member would particularly. That is the proposal we are looking at presently, and we hope to come forward in the next short while with firm legislative changes.

TIMBER LICENCES

Mr Wildman: I have a question to the Minister of Natural Resources regarding the reports in the press that the government has decided against transferring timber licences to a proposed buyer for the G. W. Martin Lumber mill in Harcourt. About 125 workers will remain out of work, as they have been for the last 10 to 12 months.

Can the minister assure the assembly that this decision was not the result of political pressure put on her or any of her cabinet colleagues from owners or principals in mills in the area who wish to obtain those timber licences?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I appreciate the honourable member's question and I would provide an absolute assurance that our decision in this case was reached after a great deal of deliberation and was reached solely on the basis of our concern about our analysis of the wood supply situation in the Algonquin district. We have a very clear description from our district manager and our forest resources group that the wood supply situation in the Algonquin district has been under significant stress for many years as a result of a continuance of what would be described as essentially high-grading practices, that the forest is in need of significant renewal and that we have undertaken to carry out an analysis of future wood supply needs and the availability of crown wood to meet those needs and have decided not to reallocate those particular crown licences until that study is completed. That was the sole reason for our decision in this case.

1510

Mr Wildman: The minister's reply seems to indicate that there are in fact too many sawmills for the amount of timber in the area. If that is the case, or if the minister is indicating that the wood supply is stressed, why is it that the ministry did not follow the suggestion of Peter Hattin, who was running the G. W. Martin mill prior to its shutdown, that all mills in the area should have to slow down production rather than denying one mill any timber?

Hon Mrs McLeod: The honourable member may well be aware that there are a significant number of mills operating in the Algonquin district. I think there are in total some 200 mills. Many of those mills are operating with what is essentially a private wood supply rather than primarily with crown wood. All the mills in the area are operating at below capacity because of the restricted availability of wood.

The indication was made to the G. W. Martin manager that we would in fact be prepared to issue a mill licence so that the mill could be operated once again using private wood sources and that

we were withholding the crown licences and would not be reallocating the crown wood which had formerly been allocated to that particular mill until our study was completed. Our study will look at the needs of the total area as well as—and I would stress this—crown wood availability, which is what we of course have to manage and distribute.

I want to point out, of course, that this mill was part of the larger groupings of G. W. Martin Holdings. All those mills were closed and had been closed for a period of over a year. The Ministry of Natural Resources has worked very co-operatively with the people of G. W. Martin in order to ensure that, with the exception of this one mill, all others are now operating either as individual enterprises or through a consolidation. It was only in this one particular case, because the mill was not in fact operating now, that we felt it would not be responsible for us to make commitments of crown wood with a transfer of ownership, with starting the mill up again, when we could not ensure without a study that the crown wood would continue to be available in those volumes.

CLOSING OF CAMPGROUNDS

Mr Villeneuve: My question is to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. As the minister knows, the parks season is now open. We have four parks in the St Lawrence area that are not open because of closures earlier this year. A request has come from the standing committee on public accounts regarding whether it is in the mandate of the St Lawrence Parks Commission Act for it to close parks.

Can the minister report to this House whether it is his opinion that the mandate includes the closing of some of our St Lawrence parks?

Hon Mr Black: Mr Speaker, as you know, the St Lawrence Parks Commission has responsibility for the operation of the parks in that area—

Mr Villeneuve: That is right: operation. That is right.

Hon Mr Black: I am sure the member wants to hear the answer or he would not have asked the question.

We believe that includes the decisions as to which parks should be open at which times and which parks may not be open at other times. That is a responsibility that has been given in legislation to the St Lawrence Parks Commission. The people on that commission are people who live in eastern Ontario, who have concerns about eastern Ontario and who act responsibly in trying to make decisions and ensure that the taxpayers' money is well spent. We believe they are doing a very fine job of that.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Elston moved first reading of Bill 169, An Act to amend certain Acts Relating to Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy.

Motion agreed to.

Hon Mr Elston: Mr Speaker, I do have another bill, which I have misplaced at the moment. I will have to stand that one down meantime.

CITY OF OTTAWA ACT, 1990

Mr Chiarelli moved first reading of Bill Pr60, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to.

MUNICIPAL FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND
PROTECTION OF PRIVACY STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

LOI DE 1990 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ACCÈS À
L'INFORMATION MUNICIPALE ET LA PROTECTION
DE LA VIE PRIVÉE

Mr Elston moved first reading of Bill 171, An Act to amend the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1989.

M. Elston propose la première lecture du projet de loi 171, Loi portant modification de la Loi de 1989 sur l'accès à l'information municipale et la protection de la vie privée.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

The Deputy Speaker: Any further introduction of bills? If not, orders of the day.

Hon Mr Ward: The first order. Also, Mr Speaker, there has been agreement that the time should be split among the parties, so I would seek unanimous consent to do so.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to do so?

Agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

INSURANCE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1989

Mr Elston moved third reading of Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance.

Mr Ferraro: It is with great pleasure that we finally come to this position where, indeed, I can put on the record some final and short comments pertaining to the process and, indeed, to Bill 68. Initially, I want to, if I may, thank the minister for the faith and the privilege that he gave me in helping to participate in the process. He has been criticized on many occasions for the fact that he has left the carriage of the bill, to a large extent, in my hands and I just want to say publicly to him that I am grateful for that faith and that confidence.

As well, it would be wrong of me if I did not thank the members of my ministry, the staff, the people who have nursed—certainly in my case—me along through a very, shall we say, trying and challenging experience. I said a couple of weeks ago, and I say it to my friend from Algoma, that I describe the whole process of Bill 68 as a very penitential experience and, indeed, it was.

I do not know if God lets politicians into heaven, but if he does I am sure members of my own government on the committee have garnered quite a few points when he is going to consider the final decision. I want to, as well—

Interjections.

Mr Ferraro: I mentioned them, but I also want to thank the members of the opposition. They were on some occasions outrageous. They were on some occasions very challenging, but I would say, quite succinctly, they were certainly committed to their points of view.

1520

To the members of my party who were on that committee, they endured some very difficult presentations and deserve all the credit that I can give them from the fact that they not only participated, but participated in a very positive way. I am grateful, as I am sure all members of our party certainly are.

I want to talk briefly about why we have to deal with Bill 68, why it is here, and to dispel to some degree some of the myths created by members of the opposition and others pertaining to the fact that we were not listening, that through the whole process we

had our minds made up, that that was it and that no changes came about. That is categorically wrong.

Members will know, I am sure, that the reason we got into this whole debate on auto insurance in the province of Ontario was precipitated in large part by the cost factor. As everyone will know, in 1986 the average insurance premiums rose by 24%, followed in the subsequent two years by rate controls by the government.

Obviously, we not only had a problem dealing with the price, the affordability, but the availability situation became serious. We had price controls on and insurance companies pulled in their horns. Even to this day some people are in the Facility Association who should not have been there. I would like to think, and I believe, that with the passage of Bill 68, many of these wrongdoings and wrongs would be put right.

Members of the opposition said that we tried to ram this legislation through, that we have not talked about it. I would point out to the members that, certainly in my case and I am sure in the case of many people in this House, we talked about auto insurance in the province of Ontario in 1985 during the election; in 1987 during the election. We had a number of reports later; Osborne, the auto insurance board hearings. As everyone in the House will know, it culminated finally in first reading for Bill 68 on 23 October last year. Second reading, the House will know as well, occurred on 14 November 1989.

During that period of second reading, 26 members spoke during five days of debate. There were 20 days of public hearings in five cities: Toronto, Thunder Bay, Sudbury, Windsor and Ottawa. There were four days for clause-by-clause consideration, one day for debate on adoption of the report from the committee, two days in committee of the whole and 18 days debating the motion for time allocation. I would say, quite clearly, the allegation that we are ramming this through is totally unfounded.

During the public hearing debates, in particular, we had without question a lot of people who made presentations. They were sincere presentations; they were certainly enlightening. But in my view, the vast majority of people who made presentations, or certainly a majority of them, will be better off under Bill 68 than under the present legislation. Indeed, many of their concerns and apprehensions, in my view, were somewhat unfounded.

I am mindful of the fact, and I am sure most reasonable people are, that there is never going to be a perfect piece of legislation. There is going to be a requirement, an adjustment period required, and we are going to hear some horror stories. Hopefully, with the new insurance commissioner and with the new legislation and tougher regulations in place, we will be able to address them in a quick and reasonable fashion.

Let me be a little more specific in regard to, as I indicated, some of the changes that were made to the bill from its inception. I will digress a little bit. I want to say again to the House that it is regrettable that much of the discussion, first, got into a debate dealing with litigation and lawyers, and that was where predominantly a lot of the opposition came from. I understand that, but to suggest that the judicial system, that the process of tort was the main reason for Bill 68—and indeed that is where most of the opposition came from, mindful of the fact that we are still allowing tort in serious cases—to me was unfortunate.

I point out that auto theft alone amounted to a cost to insurance companies which passed that cost on to the insureds of this province, the 6.2 million people, of half a billion dollars last year alone, which is in excess of the legal costs that lawyers would get dealing with tort actions. I mention that because, again, most of the discussions unfortunately were centred in that area, and it is a

much broader problem. Subsequently, we had to deal with it in a much broader perspective, and deal with it I think we did.

To be a little more precise—and I apologize, I really do. I feel badly that some members, particularly of the opposition, have had to resort to innuendo and mistruths and accusations, accusing not only members of my party but I think in a direct way all members of the House of having vested interests and of being in the pockets, if you will, of insurance companies. In my own case, in the last election I received \$700 from insurance brokers. I received as well at the same time over \$2,600 from lawyers. So if indeed I am in the pockets of the people who support me legally during an election, obviously I am somewhat misdirected.

The opposition said we did not listen to the public. The bill that is before us today for third reading has a variety of changes, and indeed most of those changes are a direct result of what we heard and indeed what the committee heard. I have a long list of changes, but if I might, I will just pick out a few.

We have section 242k that provides for a biannual review of the no-fault benefits schedule, to some degree a quasi-sunset review on its own. Section 208c forces insurers to be fairer in their underwriting practices. Section 231a was a change that the cyclists of this province told us they wanted in order to provide them better protection. Indeed, we have accommodated them, again as a direct result of their presentation and solicitations during the public hearing process. Subsection 86(2) gives better protection to those in the motor vehicle accident claims fund, a situation that has developed as a result of the insurance crisis that in our view will be alleviated substantially as a result of the passage of Bill 68.

I could go on pointing out a number of other changes, particularly in this regard, but I would end this part by dealing essentially with one more, and that is section 208a. This amendment requires insurers and brokers to give motorists fair and full notice of their intentions to change or not to renew a contract. I do not mind saying that this particular amendment was supported by just about everyone on the committee, and indeed was put forward initially and very strongly by the member for Welland-Thorold. So obviously when the member for Welland-Thorold speaks, to some degree we listen. Let's look at those changes that matter most or that perhaps people can identify with more readily, and those are the changes dealing with the no-fault benefit schedule. Indeed, we have made some substantive changes as a result of the input during the public hearings and elsewhere.

The first one is that the weekly indemnity for loss of income has been increased from \$450 a week to \$600 a week, an increase of, I believe, 329% over the present no-fault benefit schedule. The \$600, as most members of the House will know, is the equivalent of approximately \$39,000 of income in the province of Ontario, and that figure, I am told by Statscan and by my capable staff, will encompass approximately 85% of the wage earners in the province of Ontario. So a substantial portion of people will be covered in a very direct and positive way, and indeed a tremendous increase over the original no-fault benefit schedule amount of \$450.

1530

The monthly cap on the long-term care benefits was originally \$1,500. We were told by many presenters that indeed it was insufficient; that if someone needs a long-term care benefit, \$1500 a month will not satisfy his needs. Indeed, the people involved in the accidents who need that care would be at a loss for appropriate attention. We reacted by increasing it—in fact, doubling it—to \$3000 a month. So indeed we have listened on this occasion, as well, in particular dealing with the long-term care benefit amount.

Persons injured in the course of employment will now be eligible for no-fault benefits if they elect to sue in court. The no-fault insurer will pay no-fault benefits, pending a decision of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Tribunal over entitlement to workers' compensation. In other words, the injured will get ready and quick access to rehabilitation, something that many doctors, therapists and psychologists say is a necessity if people are to get the appropriate rehabilitation they need.

Changes have been made to the way income replacement benefits are calculated for small businesses and farmers, something we talked about during clause-by-clause. They will not be required to deduct ongoing expenses such as rent when calculating their income. Of course, this will increase the level of benefits that are paid to them. I know my friend the member for Wellington, who has been an advocate of that particular area, will be pleased with that change.

Psychological services and physiotherapy are now specifically recognized under the medical rehabilitation benefit.

The term "psychological adviser" has been specifically recognized for the purposes of providing a statement that medical rehabilitation services are necessary and furnishing a certificate as to the nature of an injury.

The provision that insurers do not have to pay for services provided by OHIP has been modified to require payment where the services are not reasonably available. This will prevent insureds from being forced to wait or travel to a different locale to receive necessary services.

As well, a provision has been added to include payments for damage to clothing as a result of the accident. Some of these are minor changes, but indeed important changes none the less. I could go on and on with the changes, but my time is somewhat limited.

My friend the member for Welland-Thorold had a telethon the other day. Let me dispel concern that has been expressed to me by some people, which is that if you are heading to Florida or the United States, you had better not get in an accident, because you will not be covered. You will be standing in a foreign country without any protection. That is pure horsefeathers, totally unsubstantiated.

Under the Ontario motorist protection plan, there will be no effect on the rights of Ontario drivers. In fact, the only change will be that Ontario residents insured here will be able to collect increased no-fault benefits even if they are injured in the United States.

I also heard my friend the member from Welland-Thorold, kindly referred to as the Jimmy Bakker of the back benches, say that you will have to use up all your income replacement and sick leave benefits at work before no-fault benefits kick in. That is an unequivocally wrong statement. No-fault benefits will pay up to 80% of the pre-accident income, but most income replacement plans cannot touch that. So even if a plan is in place, no-fault will top up the existing plan. In the case where an insured admittedly has the option not to use sick leave benefits, the entire 80% will be applied to the income replacement. When permitted, in cases of collective bargaining agreements and so forth, that individual can indeed take leave without absence so that the sick leave benefits will not have to be utilized.

I could probably spend an afternoon, quite frankly, with a filibuster of my own trying to dispel many of the pieces of misinformation and innuendo as alluded to by members of the opposition. I respect their right to give their point of view. In my view, and I say it to the 6.2 million drivers and potential drivers in Ontario, this is a very comprehensive, important and dramatic change in the way we do the business of auto insurance in Ontario.

Again, most people will not fully understand it, notwithstanding all they read about, or if they were watching the debate here in the House, if indeed you could call it a debate. They will not really understand it until, God forbid, they get into an accident themselves or when they renew their insurance.

But I say to the people of Ontario without hesitation again, that they should remember why we are in this in the first place, and that is the price problem. If the government of Ontario did nothing, if Bill 68 were not passed, not only will we have an availability problem but, on average, and most rational people will accept this, everyone's auto insurance premium will go up at least 30%. As it is, with the passage of Bill 68—and you take the government to task—on average, we will be looking at 8% increases in the Metropolitan Toronto and Hamilton-Wentworth areas and 0% increases everywhere else. Again, those are average increases.

Finally, I want to address something that has bothered me personally, quite frankly, not to the extent that I am losing any sleep, but to the extent that being a member of Parliament often puts different thoughts in individuals' minds. The one thought that bothered me was: "Well, you have got a very large majority. There are 93 Liberals, and indeed the opposition has much smaller numbers. Indeed you are arrogant, you are not listening and you are going to do whatever you want."

Being an advocate of the underdog and indeed, being an advocate of the underprivileged, it bothers me when I hear that type of remark made. I acknowledge, and certainly this government acknowledges, and I know my colleagues would be supportive of this, the fact that we have been given a very large majority, a trust that we appreciate in the belief that indeed the people of Ontario wanted change, that they wanted us to do what is, quite frankly, not arrogant, although the perception, the optics of it are that because we have such a large number, no matter what we do, it is arrogant. I do not believe that in dealing with Bill 68 my government has been arrogant.

I would say in conclusion, finally, that if the optics and the perception are that we have an overwhelming majority, 93 members, and that by allowing all the debate we have on this issue and having come up with time allocation we are giving the perception of being arrogant, of being too forceful, that is unavoidable and, unfortunately, a reality. But the greater shame, in my view, and the greater reality perhaps, is that by not doing finally what we were elected to do, by not passing legislation that is in the best interests, in our view, of the people of Ontario, we are letting those people down, and there is a greater shame in not fulfilling the mandate we were elected to fulfil.

I say to the members of the House, to the people of Ontario, to the insurance companies and all the drivers and the passengers, I truly believe that Bill 68 will result in a fairer, more affordable, more equitable and indeed better way of driving and acquiring insurance and, God forbid, dealing with those who get into an accident.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): I would like to thank the honourable member and remind everyone that under the time allocation proceedings, if I might refer it to you, as of Wednesday 9 May 1990, after the first paragraph, "That one further sessional day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill," that is, the bill before us, Bill 68. "At 5:45 pm on such day, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further amendment or debate."

I wanted to bring that to everyone's attention because, of course, we have the opportunity for questions and responses. But, if members will recall, we ran into similar difficulties a couple of weeks ago. If we go into questions and responses, it

then takes away from, or is added to, that time that each party is allocated for this afternoon's discussion. Does the parliamentary assistant follow me?

1540

Mr Ferraro: We have agreed, Mr Speaker. There is no question.

The Acting Speaker: Then upon direction of the House, is it agreed that the time shall be divided as is and that there will be no questions or responses? That is what I wanted to clarify.

Mrs Marland: Yes.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you very much. The member for Cambridge.

Mr Farnan: It is very important that we realize the situation right here. We must get the facts straight. And the fact is simply this: The insurance industry bought this legislation from the Liberal government. There is hardly a Liberal member in this House who has not received funding from the auto insurance industry, and hardly a member of the committee that dealt with Bill 68, all of them, again, receiving funding.

Not only did the Liberal members receive funding, but the auto insurance industry during the last election actually put a piece of literature into the mailboxes of every riding in which a New Democrat was running and had the opportunity to win the election. The auto insurance industry put this into every household. Basically, they distorted the facts. They sank a great deal of money in printing and mailing costs to get this literature into the homes of every household and, in so doing, to ensure the election of the Liberal government.

I say, in all due respect, that it really does not matter to the auto insurance industry whether it is the Liberals or the Conservatives that form the government. Members will be well aware that the Conservative Party in power took very good care of the auto insurance industry, and premiums escalated just fine during that period of time. But when it became clear that the Conservatives were on their way out and that they would be replaced, it became very important to the auto insurance industry that they be replaced by an equally willing puppet. Therefore, they put their trust in the Liberals, who they were sure they could trust, because once you take off the blue tie and put on the red tie, nothing else changes. They will continue to look after their friends in the business sector.

Indeed, this was an investment by the insurance industry, a very nominal investment on its part, literally hundreds of thousands of dollars. But when you think of the payoff, when you think of what they are getting today, they are getting in this legislation more than they even asked for. The auto insurance industry investment has come back in spades.

Ontario drivers will be paying out more and getting less. Consumer advocate Ralph Nader described the Liberal scheme as selling half a loaf for more than the original cost of the whole loaf.

This Liberal scheme will not provide adequate benefits for accident victims. In fact, their so-called no-fault plan would limit the right of over 90% of car accident victims to sue. A victim would have to be dead, or very close to it, before he or his family could sue. Those with less severe injuries will receive benefits that are inadequate. While other no-fault plans also limit the right to sue, accident benefits are high enough to properly compensate the victims. Under this Liberal plan, benefits are inadequate and will deteriorate over time because they are not indexed to inflation.

This is a bonanza for the insurance companies, which want to keep benefits as low as possible. No wonder the insurance industry is delighted with this Liberal proposal. No wonder they

are happy with the investment that they have made in the Liberal Party. No wonder that today they are already signing the cheques for the next election to ensure the return of Liberals who will do the bidding of the auto insurance industry.

Members should remember too that the new insurance commission to be set up under the Liberal plan will not have the power to set rates but only to review them—another major concession to the insurance industry, and it will cost consumers dearly.

If this not enough, there is a further \$143-million giveaway to the auto insurance companies. Auto insurers will no longer have to pay \$46 million to \$48 million for medicare annually or the \$95 million for the 3% tax levied on insurance—all of this to get an agreement from the insurers not to raise rates any higher than 8% in 1990. We are talking about a history of escalating rates over the last three years since this government obtained power.

On 7 September 1987, the Premier—in Cambridge—said, “I have a very specific plan to reduce auto insurance premiums.” What sort of plan is this? Premiums have taken off, benefits are now being cut. We are being told that premiums will continue to rise, and not just by 8% in the Metropolitan Toronto area. You can talk to the people at the Cambridge market. What is happening with their auto insurance premiums in 1990, if they can get auto insurance? They are going out of reach.

What will happen to rates in 1990? They will continue to escalate, and the pressure to increase rates will resurface in 1991.

There are two very basic things that we look for in auto insurance. We look for affordability and we look for accessibility. As far as affordability goes, this government has reneged on its responsibility. The Premier said he would reduce rates, and the people of Ontario, this very day, must be asking themselves, “When the Premier makes a promise, a very specific promise, can we trust the Premier? When the Premier says, in front of witnesses, ‘I am going to reduce rates; I have a plan to reduce rates,’ can the people of Ontario believe him?” This was a very specific promise and we know the opposite is true.

So there is no affordability within the system, and there are no regulations that will keep some sense of order on the insurance company, because there is no power to restrict. The insurance commission can only review the increased rates and not interfere with them.

The reality of the matter is that the people of Ontario dearly want to trust their politicians, but the people of Ontario, in reality, are becoming even more cynical, because unless you can correlate the word of the politician with his actions, then the people of Ontario have to say to themselves, “Where is the trust in this relationship?” When any politician faces the public and says, “This is where I stand; this is what I will do when elected,” the people have the right to expect that is indeed what will happen.

When the Premier, who should be the role model for all politicians at the provincial level, stands in front of the populace and says, “I have a very specific plan to reduce rates,” and then does exactly the opposite, then of course the people of Ontario have the right to be cynical, to distrust, not to place their confidence in a premier who would make such statements and fail to deliver upon them.

I suspect there is a collective wisdom in these chambers that we are about to embark on another election, and during that election the Premier will be dressed up in red and he will go around the province flipping hamburgers and it will be the same approach: You can talk to Dave; open, accessible Dave; honest Dave. The Premier will make promises, but what trust can the people of Ontario have in this man with his tie undone and his sleeves rolled up as he flips the hamburgers and makes his

promises? What trust can the people of Ontario have when a promise like this, so clearly stated, is broken totally and absolutely?

We are coming to the payoff. If this legislation is enacted, the auto insurance industry’s investment in the Liberal Party will result in millions of dollars in increased profits, and these profits come from the lower benefits for accident victims as premiums continue to escalate.

The old axiom of “He who pays the piper calls the tune” is very much in evidence throughout this whole process. The people of Ontario see it very clearly. The Liberals have been greased financially by the insurance industry, and in return we have the legislation today emanating from the Liberal government majority that will in turn grease the auto insurance industry. It is very straightforward. The auto insurance industry looks after the Liberals, the Liberals look after the auto insurance industry, and the group that pays the price for this particular bondage between big business and the Liberal government is the driving public of Ontario.

It is a sad day for Ontario, but rest assured, Mr Speaker, there is a political price to pay. As you will notice, they are not wearing their red ties today because they are probably a bit embarrassed by this legislation. But when they go to the people, rest assured, one of the facts that the people are going to remember is this legislation, the promise of the Premier, the misplaced trust and the abuse of the drivers of Ontario.

1550

Mr McLean: The day has finally come that has been dreaded by many, many people in this province. When we look back over the last almost three years since the Premier made his very welcome announcement with regard to his specific plan, we have certainly seen what has happened since that announcement has been made.

I want to take the opportunity to say a few words with regard to Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance. I have a great number of reservations about anything this government dreams up when it comes to insuring motorists in Ontario. We can just look at the government’s record with respect to insurance and we can clearly see that this matter has been bungled to death. It has been through committee hearings and many questions could not be answered in those hearings.

For example, this government has reneged on the Premier’s election promise of a specific plan to lower insurance rates. That promise evaporated and all we got was more insurance premium increases.

For example, this government’s meddling in auto insurance has hit taxpayers in the pocketbook extremely hard. This government had commissioned two very expensive studies for automobile insurance in this province. Then what did they do? They totally ignored both of them. The government established the expensive Ontario Automobile Insurance Board and then turned around and interfered with or completely ignored the work of this same rate review board.

For example, this government plans to implement threshold no-fault insurance in Ontario despite very pointed criticism of this system in the Osborne report, which it commissioned.

For example, this government is trying desperately to find scapegoats to take the heat over its own failures. We witnessed this government blaming doctors for not using an imaginary hotline to find hospital beds. Now we can witness the same government trying to convince the public that lawyers are driving up the cost of claim settlements.

On page 363 in volume I of the Osborne report, we can see the progression of motor vehicle accidents related to claims through the courts. We can clearly see that in 1985 there were 232,207

third-party liability claims reported, but only 4,383 of these cases went to trial and only 3,755 proceeded through to judgement. This is just 1.6% of the claims. That was through the system as it has been in the past.

Another example is the narrow wording of the threshold, which I think will cause the members some discouragement with regard to the very important bodily function, the definition of "physical" as it relates to the physical component of chronic pain. I am also concerned that the so-called generous benefits of the government's new system are not as generous as they would have us believe.

The level of no-fault benefits has not been adjusted since 1978 and they will now be increased up to \$600. When I look back over the concerns that have been related to me with regard to automobile insurance in this province, all I have to do is just look at some of the correspondence that we receive about people who have had claims.

An example is the gentleman not too long ago who had an accident with his truck. It was valued at \$2,000, and he would have to spend \$2,000 to replace it. Do you know what the insurance company is going to pay him, Mr Speaker? They want to allow him \$1,200 to replace that truck that cost \$2,000. That is the insurance company's attitude today. I do not find that to be very satisfactory at all and I am sure that the members on the government side would not find it satisfactory either.

A long time ago, I received a letter from Marilyn Graydon in Penetanguishene. I took the opportunity to write to the office of the superintendent of insurance on behalf of this young person. Mr Wilbee indicated, "I am told that a cheque of \$2,821 covering the period of 5 May 1989 to 14 July 1989 was issued to you by Royal on 24 August." That was the last date that that person received any money from the insurance company.

She had been off work all year because of her injuries. She had to let her house go because she could not afford the payments. So what happened? Not very long ago she wrote me again, indicating that the company has not settled her claim, has not dealt with her lawyer and has not paid her any more money.

What are we to do in cases such as this of these young people who are in accidents and are not being looked after with regard to the claims that they have? Is no-fault going to be the answer to that? I am not so sure, but I do have to say that the insurance companies appear to be controlling what is happening here in Ontario and the government today is going to give them more opportunity to do that.

I have a letter here from a physician who has been a physician for over 30 years. He says, "I feel I must protest that the proposed system is discriminatory and grossly unfair to many innocent victims."

Another person's letter reads:

"As a lawyer, the present civil right of accident victims to obtain full compensation for their losses will be eliminated in all cases but a few. Unless an accident victim's injuries meet the enormous special test of being seriously and permanently disabled, that victim will completely lose the right to claim for the injury itself with the associated pain and suffering.

"It does not appear to me to be fair, right or proper that a person loses that right that they should have in this society. In my opinion, the benefit to be obtained from this is illusory. Most accident victims do not need rehabilitation benefits, as OHIP pays most of the medical benefits."

It goes on to talk about job retraining: "This government has spent millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to investigate the insurance problems in Ontario. The recommendations of the Justice Osborne and Kruger commissions have been totally ignored."

Can you imagine hiring a consultant for your business or any business, Mr Speaker? They give you the report that you have paid for, some \$8 million. All of a sudden, you totally ignore what you paid that consultant for. I find it very, very hard to believe that a government would authorize two full reports such as that and then totally ignore both of them.

We look at other accident claims that people have brought to my attention. Here is a letter to the Treasurer of Ontario:

"I am against the no-fault auto insurance that is being proposed. The innocent victims of accidents have to have some access to reclaim loss of pay, suffering, mental and physical, and the right to sue up to a certain amount."

This is what people are telling us in our ridings, that they do not agree with many, many things on this insurance policy. I have had many letters sent to me.

"Ontario government's proposed motor vehicle insurance plan: I am opposed to this legislation. It takes away many of my rights and it denies me access to the courts. I will not recover full compensation. Please amend this legislation."

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This is third reading of a most important, hazardous and dangerous bit of legislation that these Liberals have ever tried to ram down the throats of people in Ontario and there are not even enough Liberals here to constitute a quorum.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1602

The Acting Speaker: A quorum is present. Continue with the debate.

Mr McLean: I was just getting warmed up when the honourable member for Welland-Thorold came in and noticed there were six government members in the House, which is very unfortunate.

Moving right along, I want to say that the people who have brought their concerns to me are very legitimate. It is not only coming from my riding but it is coming from right across this province. The stories that I read in the letters I receive are not very supportive of this legislation. As a matter of fact, the majority of the people in this province wish the government would withdraw this legislation.

However, a lot of the insurance agencies and the members are at the stage where they are dumfounded to find out that there is no alternative. What they are saying is: "Let's get the legislation passed. It is bad legislation, but we have no choice." The government has 94 members and it is going to put this legislation through, regardless of the many hours spent by the member for Welland-Thorold and the member for Leeds-Grenville.

We will be paying dearly for the aspects of this bill for many years to come. We look at the stated positions this government has taken. I have often said it is nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing. That is exactly what it is. It is not a fact at all when I see the newsletter the minister sent out saying that the opposition or people who are opposed to it should have an alternative. We do have an alternative, as did the Osborne report. There were alternatives to what this government is doing. Some \$8 million worth of studies were done to certainly tell the government what they felt was the most appropriate thing to do with regard to this automobile insurance.

Government interference in people's lives is not the way to run a government. In years to come the government will look back and say, "Should we have allowed the insurance companies their 30% or 35% increase and continued with full coverage which we have enjoyed in the past, or were we wise in bringing in this no-fault legislation to stop people from suing?"

In a couple of cases that really set the agenda of why there were changes needed. They were necessary. When you get very large court cases of \$6 million, they are not right nor acceptable. However, there has to be a happy medium whereby the public is also satisfied and willing to pay for coverage it is going to get.

What is going to happen now? Are we going to have to buy another policy to cover in case we want to sue to reclaim some of the losses that we have? Are we going to be able to do that? What we are doing here is not allowing people to sue. As I indicated earlier in my remarks, only about 1.6% of the claims actually go before the courts. So there has not been a very big percentage. Why the need for a great change?

It is certainly nice to see the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay finally come into the Legislature and listen to his colleagues' speeches this afternoon. He will be able to go back to his constituents now and tell them what the facts really are and the truth about Bill 68. So I am really glad to see he is here.

Interjection.

Mr McLean: He should also note that members are not usually allowed to speak in the Legislature or make any noise unless they are in their own seat, which the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay is doing.

However, I just hope that he does not get into an accident after this legislation is passed. As I have said before, this is not what we wanted, it is not what the official opposition wanted, it is not what the people of this province wanted; but it is what this government wants to pass and is going to pass. I say "Shame on you" for passing legislation which the people of Ontario do not want.

The Deputy Speaker: Does anybody else wish to participate in the debate? The member for Cambridge? You have already spoken; only once, please. Who else wants to participate in the debate?

Ms Bryden: I am very pleased to participate in this debate to let the people of the province know what a very bad deal they are getting in this insurance bill, Bill 68. It is a complete sellout to the insurance companies, and they know it on the other side of the House. They are not ashamed of making a sellout to the insurance companies.

The Premier promised that he had a very specific plan to bring down insurance rates. He has not done that. This bill will not bring down insurance rates. This bill will enable the insurance companies to charge what they like, with a certain amount of review by a board which will probably have the strength of a wet noodle.

This bill will allow the insurance companies to pick and choose whom they wish to insure. If they do not accept a person, that person will have to go to the Facility Association, which will cost him maybe three or four times as much as his previous insurance. This bill will allow the insurance companies to decide what the terms of the policies will be, within the limitations of the law. But those limitations are not very broad.

We have not really seen the regulations, although I believe a draft was presented to us over the weekend. But we have not had any opportunity to debate it. In the 45 minutes that each party will have today, there will be no opportunity to debate those regulations.

We are being asked under closure to buy a pig in a poke. We have not had an opportunity to debate most of the amendments from the government. They can bring in any amendments at any time they want and we will still have to accept them when the guillotine falls at 5:45 tonight.

This is not democracy. This is government by a majority that has no consideration for what the people want or for what the people have said in their committees and in their hearings and for

what the people have said when they voted for a Premier who said he would bring down auto insurance rates.

I am really shocked as to what is going on in this House and I am shocked that the Liberal Party is making that its form of government. That is what we are facing. It is not the only bill they are doing this sort of closure on. We might as well abolish the Legislature if they are going to have this kind of power to bring in legislation that is not properly debated, to bring in legislation where the facts and figures we have asked for in committee were not presented and to bring in legislation where we have not had a chance to examine the draft regulations. We still need to get a look at those.

The legislation is particularly unfair to women who have had somewhat lower rates in the past, particularly on account of their driving record, but who will still have no guarantee that there will be any consideration of their past driving record. Their rates will be set according to what the insurance companies think the traffic will bear.

1610

Mr Kormos: As high as possible.

Ms Bryden: That is right. Many of them have come to me and expressed great concern about their situation. Many of them are on fixed incomes if they are seniors, and it is not just the women in the seniors' group, but all of the seniors' groups are very concerned about whether the insurance rates that they will be asked to pay under this bill will be affordable with their fixed incomes and their limited increases to those incomes. They are living in fear until this bill goes through and they find out what the rates are, and I think their fears are well justified. In the past, some of the insurance companies used to give a discount to seniors on account of their long driving record.

Mr Kormos: British Columbia does—25%.

Ms Bryden: That is right, British Columbia does give such a discount. But no such discounts are provided for in this legislation, nor is there any reason why the insurance companies should give it, because there is really very little cap on the amount they can charge. We still have not really seen the bodies that are being set up to, presumably, monitor rates. As I say, it will be like a wet noodle tapping the insurance companies on the hand if they do not like what kind of rates are being charged.

It is a bill about which all of us should say, "Send it back and start from scratch again." Maybe the government should be looking at public auto insurance. It is the only way to get cheaper insurance. It is the only way that the drivers have some say in what the insurance is, because it is based on their records and it is based on what the government decides the rates will be in order only to make the administrative costs. There is no profit involved.

Mr Kormos: That saves drivers millions of dollars a year alone, the mere fact that there isn't profit.

Ms Bryden: Yes, we are throwing away a good, practical solution that three other provinces already have; and Quebec, to some extent, has a system that is also less.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Ms Bryden: We are throwing away a system that has worked in other places, that has brought lower insurance rates in other places, in favour of a system that is simply a sellout to the insurance companies in this province. I am surprised that a Liberal government—if it is small-l liberal—is giving away millions of dollars to the insurance companies. It looks like they are rewarding the insurance companies for paying into the contribution coffers of the Liberal Party. If that is not corrupt government, I do not know what is.

I would like to urge everybody to vote this bill down and then we can start from scratch.

Mrs Cunningham: I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to this piece of legislation that has certainly been on the public agenda now for many, many months. It has been on the public agenda since the irresponsible promise during the last election that the Premier had a specific plan to reduce the rate of auto insurance in this province.

Mr Neumann: Maybe we will find out what the Tory position is on this issue, because we have not yet, now that we have someone capable speaking. The third party has never said what its position is; maybe we will hear it today.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please, the member for Brantford.

Mrs Cunningham: All I can say right now is that the public of Ontario, especially families, is going to be very much concerned down the road when they see what this piece of legislation will really do to them, especially innocent accident victims.

Mr Neumann: Why don't you tell us what your alternative is?

Mrs Cunningham: Mr Speaker, I can tell you that what is happening in the province is that for twice the price—and the auto insurance premiums will go up, we know that, over a period of time; initially, they will stay down, but they will go up over a period of time—they will probably get, to be very general, half the coverage. But for those families that will not get the benefits, they will really be suffering significantly.

Mr Runciman: The member for Leeds-Grenville never told us what your position was.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please, the member for Brantford.

Mrs Cunningham: When the government found that in fact it did not have a specific plan, it decided to study the problem. This is a government that will be remembered as the government that studied everything and did nothing. When in fact they did take action, as on this piece of legislation, innocent victims of accidents will suffer significantly.

Right now in Ontario, when someone is injured in a car accident under the present system, basically the public is paying a significant amount of his health insurance, his workers' compensation, his rehabilitation and his retraining. We as citizens right now are paying the costs for victims of car accidents as they try to become rehabilitated and go back to work. In the future, we will be paying a whole lot more. Some have said that we will be paying as much as \$700 million more.

As the government tried to study this, initially by Slater and then by the Osborne commission, headed by Mr Justice Osborne of the Supreme Court of Ontario, and then by the government's own Ontario Auto Insurance Board, headed by Mr Kruger, the various studies were undertaken at a cost to Ontario consumers of an estimated \$13 million. What was the government told?

Mr Justice Osborne told the government that we have one of the best systems of automobile insurance and compensation in the world, and that Ontario should be exporting its system rather than seeking to import a failed American system.

Mr Kruger told the government that so-called threshold systems do not lower premiums other than perhaps in the first year of the system and that in fact premiums in threshold systems thereafter escalate. This was the information that the citizens of Ontario paid for, that the so-called threshold systems do not lower premiums other than perhaps in the first year of the system and that in fact premiums in threshold systems thereafter escalate. So as long as the government knows what it is getting into down the road, it of course can feel somewhat more

responsible for its actions, and certainly the public will let it know.

In summary, the experts have studied the problem and told the government that the answer was to improve the present system so that it would work better, but to maintain the present system. For those members in the House who want to know exactly what we would do, that is what we would do. I can tell them that would have taken some work. It would have taken the input that was made before the committee on behalf of solicitors, on behalf of the head injury groups in Ontario, on behalf of recipients, unfortunately, of benefits where they have had to claim. There are many persons in this province who could advise the government as to how it could have improved the present system. They tried to do that during the committee hearings. The government did not listen. As usual, they had their mind made up.

Since I have been elected to this Legislative Assembly, I have said that the committee system does not work. There ought to be a better way of getting good information from the public of Ontario by a government which is prepared to listen and take the best free advice it can get to fix things.

1620

Mr Neumann: Come on, Dianne. Opposition is more than opposition. Present an alternative.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs Cunningham: I can only say right now that there were specific suggestions before the committee for improvement. In fact, our party did respond and I myself personally have made specific suggestions for improvement.

Mr Neumann: You can do better than your colleague the member for Leeds-Grenville.

Mrs Cunningham: I can tell members right now that there are three gifts of consumers' tax dollars to the insurance companies with the consent of the Peterson government. I can speak because I was part of this many years ago, part of the deliberations in 1968 as we took a look at a sunset clause.

First of all, OHIP currently receives lump sum payments per annum from automobile insurance companies pursuant to OHIP's agreement with the insurance companies. I always wondered who was footing the bill for accident victims in hospitals so I took it upon myself to pursue this particular question.

Mr J. B. Nixon: Read the legislation, look at the regulations. There are no gifts.

Mrs Cunningham: If the government would like to argue the point, I suppose it could do so. I have not heard them argue it at all. This particular agreement is now abolished.

Mr J. B. Nixon: You haven't listened.

Mrs Cunningham: I have been listening and I have looked at the notes. It is abolished under the new scheme, and the cost to Ontario taxpayers is about \$50 million each year. The member can write it down and argue the point, but that is the government figure, and we have talked to the government officials within the last two weeks.

Second, the statutory right of the Workers' Compensation Board to subrogate, to recover funds paid by the Workers' Compensation Board on behalf of injured workers in motor vehicle accidents, is abolished under the proposed scheme. Actually, although there is a period of time for not only the Workers' Compensation Board to subrogate but also school board to subrogate right now, even with the present legislation there are problems with this whole issue of subrogating and the fact that there are time frames and programs that will not be covered during this process at all now. We know it is not working

now. We know that it is not working on behalf of young people who subrogate in school boards across Ontario to recover some of the moneys. In spite of Bill 82, that happens.

Hon Mr Black: School boards?

Mrs Cunningham: Yes. If a young person is injured, and the school board provides care beyond its required duty, under Bill 82 the school board can in fact subrogate and get the money back from insurance companies. They have not been very successful at that, and it is not working. We need to do something about that. Right now with the present system, the public of Ontario, which is watching these proceedings today, has to understand that the taxpayers are footing the greater part of the bill now, as they are for health care.

Hon Mr Elston: They are not.

Mrs Cunningham: They are.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs Cunningham: In fact, right now the taxpayers of this province are paying a very large part of health care costs, of education costs and of rehabilitation costs. I would venture to say that probably as much as 80 per cent of them now, and the little bit that the insurance companies pay is some 3 per cent. The OHIP is \$50 million. The statutory rights of the Workers' Compensation Board, they have given up that to the tune of \$51 million.

Third, the 3 per cent provincial tax on premiums received by the insurance companies is abolished. This amounts to a gift by taxpayers to the insurance companies of about \$95 million. All of this money that has been spent—

Mr Neumann: You can do better than read notes.

Mrs Cunningham: These are my own notes. If the member does not like that—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Will the members please respect the standing orders. One member at a time.

Mrs Cunningham: I think it is really sad that the members in this House have been so lobbied by the Premier or by the minister, who does not look the type but obviously is. He has really had the opportunity to brainwash people who have not done their homework, and that is why they are talking the way they are.

Down the road, during the public hearings, the head-injured people came before the committee and said that the definition will exclude some 95 per cent of their own people. Let's think about it. We will read it right now.

Mr J. B. Nixon: They didn't say that.

Mr Neumann: Somewhere in there you must have your own notes.

Mrs Cunningham: I am reading their own notes, if you do not mind, Mr Speaker. Ray Rempel is the executive director of the Ontario Head Injury Association. In this special edition newsletter of the Ontario Head Injury Association to its members on the subject of no-fault insurance, Mr Rempel, who has a head-injured son, stated:

"Have you wondered why the insurance companies have been eerily silent throughout this whole debate? My dog only barks when she perceives hunger. She wags her tail when she sees a gravy train approaching. The insurance companies are wagging their tails. They are admittedly very comfortable with Bill 68. Why are the insurance companies so happy?"

They are happy. In fact, I do not want to say anything too negative about the insurance companies. I would like to direct my criticism to the government that, much to the delight of the insurance companies, gave it all away on behalf of the taxpayers

of Ontario. It is us who are going to have to pay for rehabilitation, education and training, and for health care.

If in fact we are paying for it, why will the insurance companies not lower our premiums? If we do not have the same benefits from insurance policies across this province, if the taxpayers are going to be footing all these bills, why is the government not standing up and saying, "We will lower your premiums by 20%"? That is what they should be saying. As a matter of fact, what they are saying is that for twice the price they are going to get half the coverage.

I hope that no one in this institution today, in this Legislative Assembly, or any of his friends or neighbours or family members will ever have to ask themselves the question, "Is my child, my mother, my husband or my neighbour permanently physically disabled?" I hope they never have to ask that question, because if after a period of time they are permanently physically disabled they have the right to sue, and that will be about 3% of the citizens in the province of Ontario who have sustained injuries in car accidents. That is all. We have lost our rights in this democracy to sue for what we rightfully deserve and what we have in fact paid for.

What happens to the rest of them? The rest of them will have to go before some committee and somebody will decide—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Standing orders call for one member at a time. If other members want to take exception and talk for or against, they can take their own time away from the current time.

Mrs Cunningham: It is really too bad that the members who are heckling this afternoon are so ill-informed and I really hope that they will not personally suffer as a result of Bill 68 that will be thrust upon families across this province because of a stupid and irresponsible election promise. That is the only reason that we are stuck here debating this afternoon.

If the innocent victim cannot cross the very restrictive threshold, which is permanently physically disabled, then the innocent victim will be entitled only to certain stipulated no-fault benefits. Can members imagine what those certain stipulated no-fault benefits will be? I speak through experience, after being through the court system for over five or six years with the right to sue. Nobody can in fact define what is fair. In Ontario right now it may be too long, but at least in this family the innocent victim will have a chance for fairness and what is deserved. Under the system right now, that will not happen for some 97% of the victims of car accidents across this province.

I think that is a shame, especially at the same time when the innocent public that is sitting out there right now thinks that it is okay, that it is all right to see premiums go up 0.5% next year. They think they have a real deal. What they do not know is that they will have very little coverage if anything serious happens to a family member.

I can say right now that we had an opportunity to correct what was wrong with the present system and to fix it and to be able to stand up and be counted across this province and this country and to say, as Chief Justice Coulter Osborne said, we had one of the best insurance schemes in North American and one that in fact we should be exporting. Now it is not better.

1630

Interjections.

Mr Neumann: Now it is better. What else did he say about premiums?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs Cunningham: The minister has announced that some drivers will face premium increases in the 30% to 40% range

because of the new scheme for collision coverage on consumers' own automobiles. Consumers will now deal directly with their own automobile insurance companies with respect to collision damage. This will mean that insurance companies cannot recover collision losses from the insurance companies of negligent drivers. In the result, good drivers operating late-model automobiles will pay higher premiums in order to subsidize bad drivers operating wrecks. So really, if we are talking about fairness, this is another issue that could have been corrected separate from Bill 68, that could have been dealt with separate from this legislation as part of the ordinary house-cleaning responsibilities of this Legislative Assembly.

I would just like to close by saying a couple of things that are very important.

Mr Neumann: Don't sit down too soon; we want to hear your position.

Mrs Cunningham: My position on this piece of legislation has never been any different, and that is that we have another example of Peterson government mismanagement. Bill 68 is an assault on victims, and for those members who cannot stand any more, I think they should just take a look at what is happening with the FAIR committee, the Committee for Fair Action in Insurance Reform. They did in fact get out and try to inform the public so that members of the public came before the committee to give the government members some good advice, for which they did not take the opportunity.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs Cunningham: Right now rates in fact will be up, not down. We had a chance with the Chief Justice Coulter Osborne report to make a few changes. We do know that in fact we are giving up \$143 million on tax breaks to insurance companies, \$480 million on pain and suffering savings and \$150 million in economic loss. It has been a giveaway. And in the end, the specific plan to lower—of course, we do admit now that we did not have a specific plan to lower automobile premiums. We know that, and we know that in the short term they will go up slightly in some parts of the city. Just last week we heard in London, Ontario, that one insurance company in London, outside of Metro, outside of Hamilton-Wentworth, had a plan to increase at least a percentage of its drivers' premiums by some 17%.

I think it is a sad day in this House right now that we see an election promise that is not to the benefit of the citizens of Ontario, that we see a process that has not been one where the public has had a fair chance, a fair opportunity to express its concerns. We see a committee, like all other committees that I have sat on since I was elected some two years ago, that has been given its marching orders.

We now know that the real victims in this province will probably be the young children who in fact are just disabled enough that they may never work or complete their education and in fact they will have to be at the mercy of some committee of government, for which we will all pay, for their just reward, and their just reward will never take the place of what they had.

Mr Neumann: Tell us what your alternative is.

Mrs Cunningham: The alternative I have spoken to very clearly. The Liberals had that opportunity; they did not take it. Perhaps we will defeat them in the next election and fix things up. This would be one plan that we would absolutely wipe out if in fact our government or the NDP, or two of us could get together if in fact we are not successful, and absolutely give it to them. That is what we should have done a long time ago.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Members can only speak once. Do any other members wish to participate? The member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Kormos: Mr Speaker, I cannot tell you how impressed I am with the public attention that has been focused on this issue from all across Ontario. Drivers and taxpayers, and, oh yes, victims, have focused their attention on this legislation, this Bill 68, this government's broken promises, the deceit inherent in telling the people of Ontario in September 1987 that the Premier of this province had a very specific plan to reduce auto insurance premiums. Oh yeah? We know now that this Liberal scheme—oh, it is going to affect premiums, oh yeah, because premiums are going to go up by as much as 50%. The Minister of Financial Institutions made that promise, and that is one promise I can tell you he will not break.

And we know that those drivers who are forced into Facility Association, not because they are bad drivers, not because they have convictions for impaired driving or over 80, because the insurance industry, as predicted by Don McKay, the general manager of Facility Association, and as predicted by Mr Justice Osborne of the Supreme Court of Ontario, the insurance industry, once Bill 68 is passed—and I suspect that people who are watching are going to see Bill 68 pass this afternoon, notwithstanding the opposition of the New Democratic Party and the opposition of the Progressive Conservative Party. People watching are going to see Bill 68 passed. They are going to see the drivers and the taxpayers and the victims of Ontario sold out by this Liberal government in favour of huge, quite frankly, obscene profits for an auto insurance industry that I tell you, Mr Speaker, happens to be doing just fine, thank you, just fine.

I have told members this before and perhaps it is timely and I will mention it one more time. This is the last chance I am going to have to talk about Bill 68, until the election, because there is going to be an election in 1990 here in the province of Ontario. There is going to be an election in the fall of 1990, I can tell you that, Mr Speaker, and what the Premier and his Liberal gang are going to learn is that, notwithstanding all the support in the world that they might get from the big developers and from the Patti Starrs of the world and from the DelZottos of the world and the Marco Muzzos of the world, notwithstanding the support they get from those gangsters, they are going to learn that drivers can vote, insurance companies cannot, notwithstanding that the auto insurance industry in the province of Ontario in the years 1987 and 1988 contributed almost \$250,000 to the Ontario Liberal Party. I suppose the question that might be asked of the auto insurance industry is, did it really think it bought itself a government with those contributions or did it merely think that it rented it for a short while?

Let me tell you what this auto insurance industry in Canada did in 1989, because the casualty property insurance industry across Canada in 1989 enjoyed record eight-year profits, the highest profits in eight years, profits of some \$317 million. Yet this is the same industry that is crying poverty. Mind you, they have been crying poverty since the 1940s and 1950s. The very same people, the very same insurance executives and boards and companies that were telling the public in 1955 that the auto insurance industry was unprofitable in this province, said the same thing in 1965 and 1975 and in 1985 and they are saying the same thing now in 1990. They have used that to force premiums beyond affordability for the vast majority of Ontario drivers and beyond fairness for all Ontario drivers, and there is simply no doubt about that.

1640

The government is presenting legislation that, as I say, is, sadly, going to be passed. During the course of debate, we looked long and hard for 29 honest Liberal members who would vote for their constituents rather than for the big auto insurance industry and its profits. I know there is going to be a whole bunch of Liberals who are not going to be here this afternoon. There is going to be a whole bunch of members of this Liberal caucus who are not going to want to be seen by their constituents as voting in support of Bill 68 because they know what the political repercussions will be. There is going to be a whole bunch of Liberals who are not present for this vote this afternoon.

It is not good enough to merely absence oneself from the House. That will not wash. If those Liberals who are avoiding being here today think that is going to earn them recognition as somehow somebody who did not support Bill 68, they should think again, because the public in Ontario knows that the only meaningful vote this afternoon is a vote in opposition to Bill 68, because a vote against this legislation which is intended and designed as an attack on drivers and taxpayers, and, oh yes, innocent injured victims, is a vote against an insurance scheme that gives the private corporate auto insurance industry more than it has ever dared ask for.

Remember 1987 through to 1988, Mr Speaker, when the insurance industry proposed its so-called smart no-fault insurance in its presentations to the Honourable Mr Justice Osborne, conducting his inquiry on behalf of the provincial government? The insurance industry itself did not dare ask for what the Liberals in Ontario are handing over to it right now. The Liberals called their scheme smart no-fault. If that is the case, this has to be called stupid no-fault.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Kormos: This has to be called stupid no-fault if what the Liberals are giving the insurance industry now is at the expense of taxpayers, drivers and victims. We are talking about a \$1-billion payday, \$1 billion the first year alone, \$1 billion in new profits for an auto insurance industry that is doing quite well, thank you. The auto insurance industry in this province is doing well enough that it can contribute almost \$250,000 in two years to the Liberal Party.

And drivers wonder where their premium dollars are being spent? They do not have to look hard. They just look to the same people who were the beneficiaries of Patti Starr's largess and they find that the insurance industry was there as well. The only thing the insurance industry did not do was provide fridges and paint jobs. Perhaps that is all for the better, because it is harder to track down cash than it is a Frigidaire and some Sherwin-Williams.

We are talking about legislation that has been meaningfully opposed by the vast majority of communities across the province, residents of those communities and organizations which represent the members of those communities. Trade unions, labour councils, the police associations, firefighters' associations, teachers' associations, trade unionists and non-unionized workers alike know that Bill 68 is bad legislation and it is bad news, unless one happens to be an insurance company executive.

The insurance industry appeared before the standing committee on general government, and as I told the members before, once again repeated its cries of poverty. But we did not hear about any insurance company executives who faced wage or salary reductions. We did not hear about any insurance company executives who had their perks taken away from them. We did not hear about any of the plush carpeting in those executive suites

being replaced by a more mundane indoor-outdoor, did we? We heard from members of the public across Ontario who said no to Bill 68, who said no to the Liberal sellout of drivers, taxpayers and victims.

You know what, Mr Speaker? In the final 17 hours that we spoke about this matter before the Liberals imposed their—well, it is a Tory-designed, it is a Brian Mulroney-designed closure motion, we received 900 phone calls from people across this province. Phone calls were coming in from 6 in the evening until 11 in the morning, phone calls from Liberals who said, "My party membership card number is this and you can tell the Liberals, 'No more.'" There were phone calls from Liberal supporters who said, "All my life and all of my parents' lives a Liberal supporter, but never again." We received letters from members of the executive of riding associations, like letters from Herman Turkstra in Hamilton, a leading Liberal in that community who says, "No more."

We are seeing Liberal incumbents having their nomination meetings contested in numbers that have never before been experienced by incumbent members of this Legislative Assembly. We see Liberal cabinet ministers having their nominations contested, in itself virtually unprecedented. The fact remains that among the Liberal ranks themselves there is a virtual exodus of members and there is a dissatisfaction with the performance of sitting Liberals from their own membership, never mind from other parts of the community.

We talked about people like John Bates, the president of PRIDE, People to Reduce Impaired Driving Everywhere. We talked about John Bates and his contribution to this debate and his concern about murder and mayhem and bodily injury and property damage on our highways and roadways, and about his concern about the fact that this government is doing so precious little to concretely deal with impaired driving and highway safety. We talked about that. We talked about the concerns of PRIDE and John Bates, its president, and other executive members, and we talked about the fact that they tried to make contributions to the committee process but they were simply dumped on by the Minister of Financial Institutions.

They were not alone. They were in good company. Ralph Nader, members will recall, was criticized in his absence by the Minister of Financial Institutions. Why? When Ralph Nader appeared, the minister was not anywhere near, was not anywhere around to look him in the eye and say the same things he would say in Ralph Nader's absence.

Nader, among other things, told us that the United States and American jurisdictions had so long looked to Canada, and especially Ontario, for leadership in good legislation. Are they getting it in Bill 68? Not by any stretch of the imagination.

The Ontario Head Injury Association: Mr Rempel and his son appeared and they delivered among the most poignant, touching and moving of considerations. They talked about the need to include psychological injury in this threshold so that people who suffered psychological injuries, people who suffered head injuries in motor vehicle accidents, would be permitted to pass the threshold.

But no, those people are part of the 95% of all innocent injured accident victims who are going to be denied the right to any compensation for pain and suffering or for loss of enjoyment of life; 95% of all innocent injured accident victims are being denied rights by the Liberals in Ontario, by the Premier and his gang and the auto insurance industry. They are being denied any right to compensation for pain and suffering and for loss of enjoyment of life.

Not only are they denied the right to compensation, but the courthouse doors have been bolted and barred to them. They

have been told that they cannot use the courtroom, that they cannot look for remedies or relief in a court of law.

Not only are the Premier and his Liberals in the process of denying fair and adequate compensation to the vast majority of innocent victims, but they are also telling them that they as victims, as injured victims and as innocent injured victims, are not going to be permitted to use our courts of law to seek redress and to seek remedies.

1650

I tell you this, Mr Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party do not get donations from the auto insurance industry; we do not owe it a single thing. We are not afraid of them and we are not going to knuckle under to their demands. We are not going to succumb to their pressures.

One of the refrains one hears so often from members of this Liberal gang is, "You New Democrats take money from trade unionists." Members have heard people say that, have they not? We do. Trade unionists support New Democratic candidates in the NDP with their contributions, and I tell members this, we are proud to be here representing the interests of unionized workers along with seniors, students, the unemployed, farmers and small business people; we are proud to be here representing the interests and the welfare of those people.

Are the Premier and the Minister of Financial Institutions proud to be representing the interests of the corporate auto insurance industry? Why are the Premier and the Liberals so beholden to the auto insurance industry? Why are they prepared to deliver \$1 billion? Why are the Liberals prepared to deliver \$1 billion in the first year alone of new profits to that corporate auto insurance industry? It is an industry that has demonstrated its disdain for the injured and for the victim and for the client and the consumer year after year after year. It is an industry which this government's own minister—the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology—has spoken of in the following terms, when he spoke of the auto insurance industry and its shabby treatment of people here in the province.

But I tell members this, and they can count on this, that we in the New Democratic Party are opposed to Bill 68 and the threshold today—because it is threshold that is what this insurance is all about, it is threshold which means it is designed to ensure that people are not compensated, it is not designed to ensure that people are compensated. We are opposed to Bill 68 and the concept of threshold and the concept of denying innocent victims the right to compensation today, and we will be opposed to it tomorrow and next month and next year as well.

The New Democrats—and as I say, I am fearful that the Liberals here are going to force this legislation through—when this legislation passes this afternoon will remain opposed to it and we will be doing everything we possibly can to seek its reversal. We are committed to eliminating threshold from any insurance scheme in Ontario. If this legislation passes this afternoon, we in the New Democratic Party are committed to removing threshold from any insurance scheme when we form the government in this province.

I tell you what else we are committed to, Mr Speaker, we are committed to a public, driver-owned, non-profit auto insurance system, like the system in Manitoba—the one the Tories run there now; the Conservative Party as the government in Manitoba is running a public, driver-owned, non-profit auto insurance system—like the driver-owned, non-profit, public auto insurance system in Saskatchewan, which has been operating since 1946 when Tommy Douglas, the Premier of that province, and the CCF introduced public, driver-owned auto insurance, and the Conservatives run it in Saskatchewan on this very day. We are committed to a public, driver-owned, non-profit auto insurance

system like the one we see in British Columbia where the NDP government in 1973 created an insurance system that was fair, affordable, that did not discriminate on the basis of gender, that did not discriminate on the basis of age and that makes bad drivers pay more. That is what happens in British Columbia. Bad drivers have to pay more. In British Columbia good drivers pay less. In British Columbia senior citizens receive a 25% discount because they are senior citizens and they deserve that much.

We are talking about a public, driver-owned auto insurance system like British Columbia's where the elimination of profits alone saves drivers millions and millions of dollars each year, where the discriminatory practices that drivers, young and old, male and female in this province have endured for too long will be eliminated, and where there is public accountability, where the books are open, where we do not have to try to deal with branch offices of American-based corporations like so many of the auto insurance companies right here in Ontario are.

We advocate public, driver-owned auto insurance, no two ways about it, and we are committed to establishing a system of public, driver-owned, non-profit auto insurance right here in the province of Ontario when the New Democratic Party forms the government of this province.

We believe so strongly in the provision of no-fault benefits, of course we do; we have advocated them for decades. We have been as critical of this government as anybody could be about the inadequacy of the no-fault structure as it exists right now, the fact that no-faults were not indexed and similarly are not indexed in Bill 68, the fact that the no-fault benefits prohibit an innocent victim from seeking economic loss that is in excess of the maximum amount provided for under the no-fault component of an automobile insurance system.

The problem is, there is nothing new about no-fault insurance. It has been in effect in this province for well over a decade now, just as no-fault components of the insurance systems in the public jurisdictions like Saskatchewan, Manitoba and British Columbia have been in effect there for long, long periods of time. The Liberals did not invent no-fault. It has been in this province for over a decade.

What the Liberals do bring to Ontario is this concept of threshold, this concept that some people, some innocent injured victims, will get some compensation, whereas the vast majority will not. Every penny saved by virtue of not paying 95% of all innocent injured victims' compensation is going to be turned into profits for the auto insurance industry. In the first year alone, some \$823 million of compensation is going to be denied victims so that the insurance industry in Ontario can pocket it. Add to that the \$143 million of taxpayer subsidies that are going to take place in the first year alone. Add to that premium increases of up to 50% for the vast majority of drivers and we are talking about a windfall for the insurance industry that it has never dared dream of.

We are talking about an auto insurance system that we advocate, one that is public, driver-owned, non-profit, one about which there is accountability in the government, one about which there are savings for drivers, one about which there is no discrimination. But do members know what happens? The insurance industry in Ontario, the private corporate industry, is looking at profits that are so bountiful, so obscenely huge, that it will stop at no lengths to try to peddle this system, this so-called no-fault system, in reality, this threshold system. We know where it comes from. It comes from the United States.

But the sad reality of it is that the threshold contained in Bill 68 is more onerous, more draconian, more rigid, more cruel, more unfair than any threshold in any American jurisdiction at the very point in time when American jurisdictions are saying no to

threshold, when states like New Jersey are abandoning their threshold experiment, recognizing that it does not save premium dollars and that it does not protect victims and that it does not provide fairness. What it does do is provide enormous profits for the auto insurance industry at the expense of drivers, taxpayers and victims. At a point in history when American jurisdictions are abandoning threshold, this Liberal government wants to adopt it. Well, the insurance industry sure is pulling this Liberal government's strings, is it not? This Liberal government is so deep in the back pockets of the insurance industry that these guys are spitting out lint. They are.

1700

Then we have to tolerate and put up with things like the Queen's Park Report, spring 1990, from the member for Mississauga West. This has been repeated so many times. It is the PR garbage that the Liberals are passing around the province of Ontario that, oh, so sadly, is being paid for from beginning to end by the taxpayers of Ontario. That is what is going to happen.

The Minister of Financial Institutions did not appear. He was a no-show during general government hearings—a no-show. The Minister of Financial Institutions wanted to distance himself so far from this legislation that he would not even show up for the committee hearings. Did he show up in committee of the whole in the Legislature? I ask you, Mr Speaker, you were here: Did the minister show up at committee of the whole right here in the Legislature? Of course not. You saw that he was not here.

The Minister of Financial Institutions has his little PR flacks putting out their fluff and their propaganda, trying to peddle a bill of goods to the public of Ontario. But it is not washing, because it remains that surveys done throughout this province show that there is overwhelming opposition to Bill 68 and this Liberal auto insurance scheme. That opposition comes from the ridings of people like the member for Sudbury. Why, the member for Sudbury's own riding association told him to vote against this bill. If he is a no-show today, it does not count. If he is here today and he votes for Bill 68, he is voting against his constituents and for the private, corporate auto insurance industry.

The fact is that this government did not want to debate auto insurance. This government did not want to debate Bill 68. The Minister of Financial Institutions and the Premier did not want to discuss the issues or argue the points or defend their position. Where are the Liberal backbenchers today? Where are they with their praise for Bill 68? Do they dare put themselves on record? Not by a long shot.

We are talking about a government from which the stench of corruption has become unbearable, about a government whose alliances are with the big development industry and the profiteers; yes, and in some cases the outright crooks. We are talking about a government that has abandoned the voters and the taxpayers and the drivers and the victims so that the Premier's buddies in the auto insurance industry can make big, obscene profits. We are talking about a government that even refused, that simply refused, to talk about public auto insurance as an option, because it was afraid of that debate too.

So I tell the people in this province that when the Minister of Financial Institutions stands up to deliver some more of the PR fluff, like the stuff they have been distributing at taxpayers' expense, recognize that it is not a debate; recognize that it is not a response to the issues; recognize that it is an avoidance, it is a flight from the reality of the inadequacy of Bill 68 when it comes to the real people in this province.

This government may well learn something come September 1990. What it will learn, if it learns anything, is that insurance companies cannot vote. But drivers can, and drivers will. If this government thinks it can avoid auto insurance as an election

issue, it has got another think coming—because the people of Ontario are not going to tolerate corruption in their government; Liberals who are the associates, as I say, of the Patti Starrs and the DelZottos and the Marco Muzzos and the big developers and who will sell out the voters of Ontario for big profits for the insurance industry. Oh, the Minister of Financial Institutions can stand up and read his prepared speech and read some of the PR fluff that has been generated by his hack writers, but it will not count because the fact remains that the minister would not, nor would any members of this government, participate in the debate about this insurance bill. He knows that and the people of Ontario know it. The government would not look to the options.

We will be voting against Bill 68 because we are not afraid of the insurance industry. We will vote for the seniors, the workers, the unemployed, the small business people and the youth of Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): I feel like the honourable member and myself have travelled down Route 68 together over these last few weeks.

Mr Runciman: Like the member for Welland-Thorold, I have spoken at length on this issue for the past number of months it seems, on and on, and today is the culmination. It is not a joyous day, to say the least, in respect to innocent accident victims in this province. I think all of us who have fought this legislation tooth and nail for the past number of months are somewhat sad about the passage of this legislation today and the serious, negative impact it is going to have on innocent accident victims in Ontario in the years ahead.

We have something like 200,000-plus auto accidents in this province per year, with over 6,000,000 drivers. I think the 1987 statistics indicated in excess of 120,000 injuries as a result of those 200,000 accidents. What we are talking about, based on the government's own facts determined by actuaries, is that these innocent accident victims are going to lose close to 50 per cent of the benefits that now accrue to them under the current system of automobile insurance compensation, a system of compensation that has been described as definitely the best in North America and perhaps the best in the world. That is what this government is dismantling through this legislation, Bill 68.

It is an unfortunate day, a sad day, and one which the government, at some point, will regret. If indeed we can see some changes take place with the upcoming provincial election, hopefully this can be cut off before it does too much harm to too many individuals, families and innocent victims in this province. Our party is committed to substantive changes and certainly to ensuring that many more people will retain access to the courts when they suffer injuries as the result of the actions of an irresponsible driver on the roads and highways of this province.

We believe quite deeply in the ethic of responsibility, that those responsible for their actions should pay, and we believe that innocent accident victims should retain the right to take that at-fault driver to court. As I said, 95% to 97% of innocent accident victims will no longer have that right under Bill 68. That right is going to be lost to them as a result of the Liberal government's no-fault legislation.

We have talked about this ad nauseam and it has had little or no impact on the Liberal Party, on the Liberal cabinet nor, perhaps more important, on the backbenchers in the Liberal ranks, 70 or 80 of them who have certainly not heeded the concerns expressed by members of the opposition parties and, perhaps more important, have not heeded the concerns expressed by their own constituents, thousands and thousands of people who have appealed to the Liberal Party over the past number of months in respect to this legislation.

From my own perspective, I guess, the people who were not heeded were the people who took the time to appear before the standing committee studying Bill 68, the overwhelming majority of whom were opposed to this legislation and many of whom had no vested interest, nothing whatsoever to gain by passage or failure of this legislation. But they appeared before us because of a very genuine, sincere concern about what the future holds for innocent accident victims in this province if this no-fault legislation passes through the House, which it appears it is going to do today.

1710

We talked about the multitudes of people who are going to suffer, not just innocent accident victims but other specific groups, like small, independent business people who are not going to be covered for non-economic loss, who could indeed see the loss of businesses, homes and life savings as a result of this legislation.

What the government and its insurance company cohorts will say to those individuals is simply: "Buy additional insurance. Cover your tails by buying additional insurance." They say that quietly out of the side of their mouths, while at the same time, out of the other side of their mouths, they are saying: "What we're going to do is stabilize your rates, folks. The most they're going to go up is an average of 8% in urban areas and perhaps 0% in areas outside Metropolitan Toronto and the Hamilton and Burlington areas." Out of the other side, as I said, they are telling people to buy additional insurance to try to cover their tails in the event of serious accidents and non-pecuniary losses.

We have talked about farmers, who are going to be in a similar kind of situation. This is going to be based on net income, and we know that many farmers in this province have very little, if any, income. Most of it is plowed back into their operations. They indeed are going to be on the receiving end in terms of the negative impact of this legislation when it goes through.

Teachers are another group. We could talk about all sorts of groups in society who are going to suffer negatively. I want to mention teachers because there has been a bill of goods sold, or attempted to be sold, to teachers in this province in respect to how the legislation is going to impact on their sick leave benefits. They said, "Look, you don't have to draw down on sick leave," but the reality is that under the government's legislation, the maximum payout is going to be \$600 per week. We know that the majority of teachers in this province are earning significantly more than that. If indeed they are a single-income family and they have a mortgage payment to make or other pressures applied to them, they are going to be required, in order to meet their commitments, to draw down on that sick leave. That is a reality. They are going to have to draw down on that sick leave. As a result, they are again covering the tail of the insurance industry and having a negative impact on protections for their own long-term future by having to draw down on sick leave.

We talked about other protections that are built into bargaining agreements with the unions and so on and, in the private sector, with management as well, where we have salary continuation plans. Salary continuation plans are going to be hit first under this legislation. If you happen to be unfortunate enough to be in an accident, what happens is that you are going to have to be hit with your salary continuation plan before no-fault can kick in.

So again, what is happening is that we are seeing these sorts of protections that are built in, perhaps through negotiations, through discussions with management when you are hired on, perks that go along with your employment or have been fought for over many years of hard bargaining and improvements in a collective agreement—what we are hearing now is the government saying, "Okay, those are going to kick in, but we're going

to protect the tail of the insurance industry and they will take second position in respect to provision of payments and making payouts."

Those benefits to the industry, and a multitude of others, are going to total, it has been speculated by some, close to \$1 billion for the insurance industry. We know about the 3% tax on premiums which is going to be dropped. We know about the OHIP subrogation agreement which is going to be dropped. We are talking about a direct taxpayer's benefit to the insurance industry in the neighbourhood of \$143 million.

The other sums total between \$600 million and \$650 million. There are various estimates; we have heard higher. We want to put on the record how the insurance companies save those, because I am sure the minister will be disputing that and saying that consumers are going to reap the benefits of this. But in effect, it is indeed a gift to the insurance industry from innocent accident victims. They will be required to make this gift each and every year under this legislation.

I put this on the record: Under the present system of auto insurance compensation, the innocent victim of a motor vehicle accident has the right to compensation for pain and suffering and loss of enjoyment of life, out-of-pocket expenses, full loss of wages or salary, compensation for family members who are obliged, for example, to take time off work in order to assist the innocent victim.

The current compensation system has no-fault benefits. All drivers, regardless of fault, are entitled to certain disability benefits, limited as they are, as well as medical and other rehabilitation expenses not covered by OHIP. The disability benefits are at a low level of \$140 per week. Of course, we and others have felt that they should be increased, including Justice Coulter Osborne, who recommended that in his most comprehensive report.

What we are talking about here, as I have said, is a significant windfall to the insurance industry. The minister will try to gloss over that and talk about how, in his view, the consumers are going to be the beneficiaries of these changes, but the reality is something quite different.

Another element which I hope the minister may want to respond to is the impact on the Workers' Compensation Board. That has not been talked about at length. It is certainly not a sexy part of this issue, but again, we have heard various estimates, and I think the one from the WCB is a \$46 million per annum cost that the board is going to be faced with because of its loss of the right to recover funds on behalf of workers injured in motor vehicle accidents. That is going to be abolished under this scheme.

What that does, of course, is apply additional costs to those businesses and industries operating in this province, an additional assessment. We saw truckers stopping at the borders this past week trying to hold up traffic in protest against what is happening in this province. The impact of additional red tape, taxes, legislation brought in on those people by this government, the most antibusiness government in Canada—and that is from the president of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, who talked about this Liberal government. This kind of legislation, which is going to hurt small business people especially, is just another nail in the coffin of our ability to be competitive in this province. The minister can smile at that, but he has smiled throughout this debate. He has not paid heed to any of the very valid concerns. He and his cronies have snickered away on their very comfortable perches.

We had an announcement, a leak, last week about Commercial Union insurance—I am working by memory here—a six-star driver in the Hamilton area, I believe, looking at an increase of 17.4% under this new scheme. This is someone who has not had

an accident for six years, no charges, etc., just for the benefit of the member for Algoma.

I talked about the Minister of Financial Institutions being on a comfortable perch. I gather he was in Paris, France, when that announcement, that leak was made. I do not know whether he was there at the taxpayers' expense. He may want to elaborate on that when he takes the floor a little later on. I know that I have not been in Paris, France, at the taxpayers' expense. I suspect most of us in this Assembly have not been that fortunate. But we want to talk about the millions being wasted, the millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars being wasted by this Liberal government in respect to this legislation.

We have talked about the windfall of the insurance industry approaching \$1 billion. Now we are talking about at least in the neighbourhood of \$20 million, perhaps more, tax money lost by the ineptitude of this government in respect to its dealings with auto insurance in this province.

The establishment of the automobile insurance board, the extensive periods of time that it devotes to two issues assigned to it by the Liberal government—and which issues, once they were reported to the Minister of Financial Institutions, were in essence flushed down the toilet, at a cost, as I said, of significant millions, but not until after this group of Liberal worthies was well ensconced in very plush surroundings in North York. Certainly no cheap seats for those folks, only the best quality of furniture, the best of cars, the best of all sorts of things that go along with being a supporter of the Liberal Party in Ontario.

They are well looked after, and that is why they can sit in their seats and snicker here today, and that is why they could snicker in the past while we dealt with this legislation. That is why they could snicker when we have had very seriously concerned witnesses appear before us and testify before us about the negative impact on innocent accident victims, and why we get snickering and smirks and laughs from the Liberal members, including the Minister of Financial Institutions.

I think it is reflective of this whole government, the arrogance, as I said in the past, that starts in the front bench and ripples all the way to the back row. We have seen it when we have dealt with this legislation, the fact they are unwilling to listen to the people of this province on this very, very important issue.

1720

We are talking about people who are going to be hurt by this legislation. I have said this before, but I do not think I can say it on enough occasions. Innocent people in this province are going to be very seriously hurt by this legislation.

Perhaps the most difficult element of this is the less fortunate people in society, the unemployed, the single-parent families, the people who have very modest incomes indeed and who do not have the opportunities for additional benefits. They are not represented by organized labour, they are not on management staff of industries and business. They do not have the perks that go along with those opportunities in society. What is going to happen to them under no-fault legislation? They are going to be shut off, shut out, like so many people in society. This is bad legislation that hurts people.

Hon Mr Elston: It is a pleasure finally to be able to come to this stage of this legislation where we can wrap up and have a vote to ensure that we proceed in a positive fashion and deal with the problems which have been created not just yesterday or the day before, but over a whole series of years.

Remember the days of a former administration. The Progressive Conservative Party for a number of years held sway in this province, and there was a gentleman from Leeds-Grenville who was a member of the Legislature in those days. He was the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and had the

authority to deal with issues surrounding auto insurance in the province of Ontario. Like so many things, he was able to go along blithely ignoring the problem and, in fact, hoping that it would go away.

Lo and behold, for that gentleman, fortunately enough, it did go away. He was asked to leave, along with his buddies, so that somebody could come into this Legislative Assembly who had the authority and the will and the ability to move forward with new policy directions which would provide an assistance to the people of the province.

We have been a very active administration. We have been dealing with the issues as they came forward in a way which showed balance and which showed a progressive concern for the problems of the people of Ontario. This problem was a result of an inability, perhaps also an unwillingness, to understand the fundamental problems which had been created by requiring mandatory insurance for all who have automobile drivers' licences in the province.

We do not argue with the need for having mandatory insurance. We know that people must be protected as a result of problems created by accidents in this society. There is no question that as long as we have automobiles, passenger vehicles, commercial vehicles driven on our roads, there will invariably be accidents of one sort or another.

So many compelling pieces of information were brought forward to us that told us time and time again that accidents on a huge number of occasions have been caused merely by a moment's inattention, by a concern that was generated by the activities of a youngster in the back seat of a car that was being driven by a parent who responded to a momentary need and, as a result, an accident occurred; or a response to something outside the vehicle that took a person's attention away from the road and in fact there was no ill intention on the part of the driver who caused the accident.

We also know that the congestion on our highways is such and the volume of traffic such that there are accidents as people move from one lane to another. We knew that when we heard from those people that accidents could not be prevented totally in the province and that, as a result, the cost and the systems had to be borne to pay for the medical treatments and the long-term care provided for those people who were unfortunate enough to suffer injury. We knew that.

We know as well, unlike the socialists, the New Democratic Party, that you cannot get something for nothing. I do not accuse my friends from the Progressive Conservative Party of trying to sell us something for nothing. They just forget to tell us the price tag associated with their options. They do not want to talk about their prices. Those people in the official opposition, however, believe they can sell people a product that they say offers something but charge no cost.

They are all nice people. I do not have any concerns about the personal attributes of any one of the members of this Legislative Assembly who sit with the opposition parties. They have their own particular points of view, they have their own needs, and the members from the opposition parties who have spoken here today have a need to show that they are on guard for the opposition to this legislation. But those people have not come forward with a plan which addresses the cost of insurance that we were required to address; nor have they told us what they would do to manage the high incidence of accidents in this province.

We have put together, as a government, not only a response to the insurance question but also an overall strategy to deal with the hurt and the problems associated with driving automobiles in the province. We started off on 15 September of last year talking to people not only about insurance product reform but also about a

new initiative and series of activities undertaken to decrease the accident rates altogether.

How many people have we talked to, certainly among the members, who have come forward to me and said: "Minister, your crackdown on speeders on the 400-series highways has had an effect. We have seen them out there. We have been stopped by them"? How many people have been stopped and reminded that they had not been wearing their seatbelts as required by the statute law of this province?

In the early days of the crackdown, in October of last year, the regional municipalities of Halton and Waterloo went through a series of initiatives which found that more than 1,000 drivers in each of those municipalities were not wearing their seatbelts. We found that if we required the people to wear their seatbelts, we could save between 80 and 90 lives in the province, if people would just abide by those rules.

We found that if we required more safe design of highways, we could also reduce the cost to our society and to the drivers of our province, if we implemented those changes. And we have moved not only on the enforcement and on the design area, but also on putting together new traffic systems which will allow the reasonable flow of traffic in high-volume areas in a way which will allow for safer use of our highways.

We have done a whole series of initiatives which will ensure a response not just on the insurance side of this problem, but fully right across the board through the co-operation of over five ministries. With the active support of the police in this province and others, we will reduce the accident rates in this province.

But more than anything else, we recognize that there will be a need to assist those people who are unfortunately affected by the results of accident injury. We know that, just as the people from the Progressive Conservative Party were unwilling to deal with the issue of affordable insurance, we have moved forward to provide a balance between the benefits which are provided to the people who have accidents and the costs of purchasing those benefits.

1730

You do not get something for nothing. There is no free ride. There is no Utopia that is offered to us from time to time by the members of the official opposition. They offer us their solution, a mind-boggling inability to escape their socialist rhetoric to the extent where they believe themselves now when they speak, but they are the only ones.

When people analyse what is being done with respect to this new product legislation, they will understand the balance this offers to the people of the province. We have a threshold no-fault system provided here by this legislation. There is no question about that. We have been up front in telling the people it is a threshold no-fault system, that it is being delivered by private industry, that it is being put forward as a balance between benefits and cost.

We have taken the system that was here previously, that exists as we speak today, and we have improved upon it by taking the no-fault benefit regime which is now in front of the people of the province and saying that \$140 a week for people is inappropriate.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have been trying throughout the afternoon to get the standing orders respected. It is not because it is 5:30 that we should stop doing so. One member at a time, please.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Elston: The opposition, particularly the New Democratic Party, has had a hard time letting the Liberal Party

put forward the real facts around this policy. I do not expect them to allow us to speak freely and openly at this point. Why should we expect them to change their tack? Why should we expect them to respect the democratic process? They have not done it to this point.

They have had somebody who likes to talk a lot and who likes to confuse the factual material upon which this material is based. They have supported the types of advertisements placed in the paper by some of the advocates who do not support this particular piece of legislation, and that is their way. That is what they think they should be allowed to do without being called to account. But I am calling them to account because there are things that have to be told about this legislation that they have been unwilling to provide to the people of the province.

First of all, the weekly benefits moved from a meagre \$140 per week all the way to \$600 per week or 80 per cent of the gross, whichever is most appropriate. What is more we have moved so that we have supplementary medical and rehabilitation services benefits available to a limit of \$500,000 when it previously was \$25,000. We have instituted long-term care, up to a limit of \$500,000, to assist people who are injured in accidents, a monthly benefit rate of \$3,000 where previously that did not exist.

The member for Leeds-Grenville spoke about how people were disadvantaged if they were seniors, if they were on low incomes, if they were homemakers, by not being included in our legislative amendments. He is wrong. We have included in the no-fault benefits for the first time, seniors, the unemployed, students, and we have included a higher benefit for the unpaid homemaker. We have provided, for the first time under the no-fault benefits, \$50 per child per week to a maximum of \$200. We have provided an increased death benefit. We have increased those no-fault benefits substantially to look after the problems associated with minor injuries caused by accidents in this province.

They have not spoken about that. They have decided not to tell the people that this regime has vastly improved those because they are afraid to put forward the full story so that the people of this province can understand what is being proposed here. But I will not shrink from putting forward the story, and I am in the process of showing how this is a benefit to the people of the province.

I will not tell the people of the province, as the opposition parties are trying to, that they can get those benefits without cost. There is a cost of a product and we must pay the price for a product. There is no question about that. Something for nothing is something that those people will try to sell to the people of the province. We are a realistic party.

When we go forward further we have taken into account, unlike the allegations that are made by the opposition, not only the material that has been worked on by Slater, Osborne, Kruger and others, but also the material that was brought forward at the legislative committee hearings.

Much has been made of the fact that I put a great deal of reliance upon the shoulders of my friend the member for Guelph, that as my parliamentary assistant he shepherded through this committee stage a very complex piece of legislation in a way which was not only responsible but which was responsive to the questions and inquiries that were made and which was understanding and sympathetic to the people who brought forward their material for us to review.

I will not tell the people of the province that we agreed with all the representations of every person who came in front of the committee, because from time to time we must disagree with the positions being brought forward. We disagree with the NDP

because we do not want to have public auto insurance, and we do not have that. We will disagree on that. We cannot agree with the members of the Progressive Conservative Party who stand for no change. We cannot agree with everybody, as the opposition members try to make people believe it does.

At the moment, those people are holding themselves out to the lawyers of the province as great white crusaders, the great handlers of the lawyers' cause. Those people are holding themselves out for the short term as the champions of the opponents. Those people who think the New Democrats are championing their cause should beware. Those people have consistently talked about other things than the type of program which they say they are supporting now. Their people have consistently talked about pure no-fault delivered publicly. I agree with that. On public auto insurance they have been consistent.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Elston: It is not only on public insurance that those people have done that, but they have been consistent in saying it should be pure no-fault. But it is pretty interesting, their consistency. As I said before, I agree they were consistent. They want public insurance and they want to try to make everybody believe that they support their cause, but they will not and they cannot.

I should move forward to talk about some of the other misconceptions which have been left as a result of some of the material put forward even today. I am concerned that people would have the types of misunderstandings which they have conveyed on the floor of the House after so much opportunity has been given for them to really understand what this product is all about. These people stand up at one time or another and say that the product is too expensive, and then they go on to say that there should be a three per cent premium tax placed on the cost of premiums, so that we do not give a break to anybody who is paying the auto insurance premiums across the province.

Whether it is a reimbursement to OHIP or a three per cent premium tax on top of the premiums to be paid by the people, it would be passed through. There is not any question that those people do not understand that we have done a couple of things which provide consistency with the way in which we fund our health insurance plan. One part of that consistency is that we as a society will bear the costs of the provision of services to people who are in our hospitals and otherwise to provide them with the care they need. We have done that in a way which is consistent with our overall plan for the Ontario health insurance program.

With respect to the three per cent tax, if they are suggesting that they are going to go out and add another three per cent to the cost of premiums, let them do it. We are not doing it. We will not do it.

Mr Kormos: In BC they pay 4% and it is still cheaper.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, please.

1740

Hon Mr Elston: There are a number of things I could say about the way in which this debate has been conducted. There are a number of things which ought to be said to the people of the province, however, about the product. There is no question that this is a threshold system. I talked about the no-fault benefit side and how it has been increased. There is no question but that the test we are implementing is a very strict test, so that serious and permanently injured people will be able to have access to the court system.

That would cause some trouble if there were no way at all that people had of trying to deal with disputes about the provision of

the no-fault benefits, which are seen to be a very good level of benefits indeed. But there are alternative forums to deal with disputes about the amount of money to be provided to people who are victims of accidents. We have provided that in an alternate dispute resolution mechanism which will allow independent parties to assess whether or not an injured victim is getting his or her just compensation.

We have not taken away the right to a forum which is independent. No, they will not be going into the court system necessarily, although there are opportunities to sue upon the contract of insurance if that is the route that is to be opted for. But we have provided for the people a quicker way of getting access to the money they need to try, as best they can, to get over the results of an accident. Between 10 and 30 days will be the response time for the people who are providing the benefits out of the insurance companies.

We have put in place an independent insurance commission that will be able to take action on behalf of the individuals who need compensation.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Is that like the rate review board that you set up?

Hon Mr Elston: Mr Speaker, I seem to have hit a raw nerve. Those people in the New Democratic Party do not seem to be able to listen. They do not seem to be able to want to hear the truth. They do not want to hear the truth.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please, the member for Windsor-Riverside.

Hon Mr Elston: They do not want to hear about the broad series of powers under this legislation which will allow the new commission and commissioner to intercede on behalf of those people who feel they are not being dealt with fairly by the insurance companies. We agreed with many of the propositions that were put forward in reports by Osborne and Kruger and others who said there must be a better performance.

Mr Laughren: Bunch of bandits.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Will the member for Nickel Belt please withdraw that statement?

Mr Laughren: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: Start off with the truth. Tell us about the history.

Hon Mr Elston: The member for Windsor-Riverside has been very helpful in his interjections, because it shows just how lacking in a basic understanding of this he really is. He has, like his fellow colleague the member for Welland-Thorold, tried to prevent us from putting the factual basis of this product on the floor of the House. That seems to be the best of their opportunities. They do not want us to debate this. They never did and they do not now.

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, please.

Hon Mr Elston: But let me say this: We have moved forward with this report on a whole series of fronts. These people would confuse the public by saying this is all that we are doing, that we are not trying to take down the accident rate. I have already gone through the things we have done to try to manage the dislocation caused by auto accidents in other spheres.

I have tried, although it is very difficult to speak with the members of the New Democratic Party barracking they way they are, to show what the product itself looks like, the balance

between those who are going to have access to the courts for serious and permanent injuries and those people with less serious injuries who will be able to go to different forums if they have disputes about the level of benefits.

It is all there to provide an independent resolution to disputes. It is all there, in a fairness which I think will become more clear when we are able to put forward the whole story and not just the snippets that have been provided to this point by the opposition party and by the opponents who have advertised in the newspapers at the expense of taxpayers.

Mr Kormos: You really haven't—

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, please.

Hon Mr Elston: We will be able to tell the people much more clearly what this bill is about in the upcoming weeks ahead. But let me say this: The key to this entire activity is the balance between the costs so that people will be able to afford the product, so that people will be able to find there will be an availability of product that they can have access to, so that there will be benefits which will be available at a time when they are needed to try the best we can to put people through a whole series of dislocations that are caused by auto accidents with the least amount of dislocation that is possible. That is what this is about, to have a timely and reasonable response to those accident needs.

I want to take just a couple of minutes to say this about my colleagues on my side of the House. I had some words earlier about the dedication of the member for Guelph, my parliamentary assistant. He has shown a great resolve and has shown in fact that he has had a sympathetic ear for the people who have come forward and he has brought back recommendations from those hearings which allowed us to make changes which have been enumerated. We have made changes not only to the benefit levels but also to deal with certain specifics like the dislocation that could have been caused to cyclists and others.

That member was ably supported by the Liberal members on that committee who listened patiently while the barracking continued from the member for Welland-Thorold and the member for Leeds-Grenville as they went through charade after charade of concern, as they wasted the time by taking over the floor of committees and others. Those people are a credit to the legislative process because the Liberal members of the committee have heard and have listened and have brought forward their concerns to us so that we could make some changes. They have been patient, because they also had to be here while those people took over the floor of this Legislative Assembly for day after day after day, who put forward allegations which could not have been further from the truth. They have tried to lay at the feet of the members of our Liberal Party certain attributes which were so erroneous as to be able to be made only in this House. They have done things in an attempt to discredit the members who worked so hard for the Liberal Party on this particular piece of legislation which are a discredit to the legislative forum. I feel about that very strongly.

In the end, we have an obligation on the government side to bring forward a response to a legislative need. We saw the problem. We analysed the problem. We took the advice which was contained in the Slater and the Osborne and the Kruger reports, which many people on the opposite side have said we did not take account of. We moved it together with all the material that we were able to muster and we brought forward this balanced presentation.

It is not, as I said at the outset, only insurance product reform. It is reform of our traffic management systems. It is enforcement of our speed limits. It is enforcement of seatbelt laws and others.

It is the implementation, at the behest of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, of the ghost car program, to ensure that there is fairness in the system of repairs. In putting all of those things together, we have a package that is balanced and we have a package that is affordable and we have a package that addresses the needs of the people of the province.

I have one last message. This system will see good drivers in this province getting the best rates, and the bad drivers will not be treated as well, although that is the allegation of those people. People who are convicted of criminal offences like impaired driving or dangerous driving in fact are penalized more than ever because they will not receive their weekly benefits. They will be asked to answer the charges laid against them in the criminal courts under the Highway Traffic Act, and they will have to pay higher premiums.

That is how this system works. It is a fair system. If those people would bring forward all the facts and not just the material which they have used to this point, they would find that this is the balance that the people of the province wish.

1750

The House divided on Mr Elston's motion for third reading of Bill 68, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes — 64

Ballinger, Beer, Black, Bossy, Bradley, Brown, Campbell, Caplan, Carrothers, Chiarelli, Cleary, Conway, Cooke, D. R., Daigeler, Elliot, Elston, Epp, Faubert, Ferraro, Fleet, Fontaine, Fulton, Grandmaitre, Henderson, Hošek, Kanter, Kerrio, Keyes, LeBourdais, Leone, Lipsett, Lupusella, MacDonald, Mancini, Matrundola, McClelland, McGuigan, McLeod, Miclash, Miller, Morin, Neumann, Nixon, J. B., Oddie Munro, Offer, O'Neill, Y., Patten, Phillips, G., Polsinelli, Poole, Ray, M. C., Reycraft, Roberts, Ruprecht, Scott, Smith, D. W., Sola, Stoner, Sweeney, Tatham, Velshi, Ward, Wong, Wrye.

Nays — 27

Allen, Bryden, Charlton, Cooke, D. S., Cunningham, Eves, Farnan, Grier, Hampton, Harris, Johnson, J. M., Johnston, R. F., Kormos, Laughren, Mackenzie, Marland, Martel, McCague, McLean, Philip, E., Pollock, Pouliot, Reville, Runciman, Villeneuve, Wildman, Wiseman.

Hon Mr Ward: Mr Speaker, I wish to advise the House that His Honour awaits to give royal assent.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the Legislative Assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon Mr Alexander: Pray be seated.

The Deputy Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed a certain bill to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: The following is the title of the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 68, An Act to amend certain Acts respecting Insurance.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to this bill.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

The House adjourned at 1805.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaître, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling
Clerk: Douglas Arnott**Estimates**

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Harold Brown**Finance and economic affairs**

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycecraft
Clerk: Lisa Freedman**General government**

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman
Clerk: Franco Carozza**Government agencies**

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South
Clerk: Harold Brown**Legislative Assembly**

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan
Clerk: Deborah Deller**Ombudsman**

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock
Clerk: Franco Carozza**Public accounts**

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Regulations and private bills**

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham
Clerk: Lisa Freedman**Resources development**

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman
Clerk: Lynn Mellor**Social development**

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner
Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts
Clerk: Deborah Deller**Education**

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Energy**

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray
Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edgihoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Monday 28 May 1990

Members' statements			
Automobile insurance	1329	Greater Toronto area rapid transit	1338
Mr Farnan		Mr Cousens	
Vandalism of Jewish cemeteries	1330	Mr Wrye	
Mr Cousens		Tourist information centre	1338
Don Laughton	1330	Mr M. C. Ray	
Mr Sola		Mr Black	
Drug abuse	1330	Rent regulation	1339
Miss Martel		Mr D. S. Cooke	
Greater Toronto area rapid transit	1330	Mr Sweeney	
Mr Cousens		Drug benefits	1339
Volunteer firefighters	1330	Mr Villeneuve	
Mr Ballinger		Mrs Caplan	
Automobile insurance	1331	Land registration	1339
Mr Hampton		Mr Tatham	
Municipal finances	1331	Mr Sorbara	
Mr Brandt		Pay equity	1340
Ski championship	1331	Mr Allen	
Mr Kozyra		Mr Beer	
Statements by the ministry		Investigation into municipal election	1340
Environmental purchasing policy	1331	Mr Sterling	
Mr Ward		Mr Offer	
St John Ambulance	1332	Drivers' licences	1340
Mrs Caplan		Ms Poole	
Responses		Mr Wrye	
St John Ambulance	1333	Timber licences	1341
Mr Reville		Mr Wildman	
Environmental purchasing policy	1333	Mrs McLeod	
Mrs Grier		Closing of campgrounds	1341
St John Ambulance	1333	Mr Villeneuve	
Mr Eves		Mr Black	
Environmental purchasing policy	1333	First readings	
Mr J. M. Johnson		Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy	
Mrs Marland		Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 169 ...	1341
Oral questions		Mr Elston	
Solid waste reduction	1334	Agreed to	1341
Mrs Grier		City of Ottawa Act, 1990, Bill Pr60	1341
Mr Bradley		Mr Chiarelli	
Deregulation of trucking industry	1335	Agreed to	1341
Mr D. S. Cooke		Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection	
Mr Wrye		of Privacy Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990,	
Mr Farnan		Bill 171	1342
Constitutional accord	1336	Mr Elston	
Mr Harris		Agreed to	1342
Mr Peterson		Third reading	
Hospital financing	1337	Insurance Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 68	1342
Mr Eves		Mr Elston	1342
Mrs Caplan		Mr Ferraro	1342
District health councils	1337	Mr Farnan	1344
Mr Hampton		Mr McLean	1345
Mrs Caplan		Ms Bryden	1347
		Mrs Cunningham	1348
		Mr Kormos	1350
		Mr Runciman	1353
		Agreed to	1358

Royal assent		Lists of members	
His Honour the Lieutenant Governor	1358	Members and their responsibilities	1359
Other business		Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1362
Legislative pages	1358		
Deputy Speaker			
Time allocation	1329		
Deputy Speaker			
Adjournment	1358		

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le lundi 28 mai 1990

Première lecture

Loi de 1990 modifiant la Loi sur l'accès à l'information municipale et la protection de la vie privée, projet de loi 171	1341
M. Elston	
Adoptée	1341



Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 29 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 29 mai 1990

Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 29 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

WELLAND HISTORICAL MUSEUM

Mr Kormos: Mr Speaker, for just a few moments, let me tell you about the Welland Historical Museum. That is a non-profit, community-run, full-time museum right in the heart of the city of Welland. It has been blessed for the last four years to have as its curator a brilliant young person, Mac Swackhammer. Mr Swackhammer has contributed a great deal to the substance of that museum, has made it a living thing, not just for tourists and visitors to Welland but for the people who live in the community.

His latest coup was to acquire the 30 murals from a great Canadian train. These, as you undoubtedly know, Mr Speaker, are murals that were painted by, among others, members of the Canadian Group of Seven and were contained in the Canadian Pacific fleet that did the transcontinental runs. There were 36 originally. Six were lost and so simply will never be seen again. The 30 remaining, which have for a long time been merely stored at the National Museum of Science and Technology in Ottawa and have had only one major public exhibit, and that was in Kleinburg, are now at the Welland Historical Museum. They are there from the present through to the end of the month of October. It is an outstanding display. Anybody who misses it has missed a major event in Canadian history, in art history and an opportunity to see some of the finest works that Canada has produced.

We are proud of that in Welland. Mr Speaker, you should get down there to see it. So should these other members, because everybody in Welland is going to have a chance.

SKILLS TRAINING

Mrs Cunningham: My statement today is directed to the minister of all education. I read with interest the report entitled, Ontario's Labour Market: Long-Term Trends and Issues in the 1990s. It was released last week, and the report identifies one very important trend: that the importance of training will increase as the level of skills required in most jobs continues to rise.

If the minister were here, I would be able to say directly that I have been making this statement in the Legislature for over two years. If we are to remain competitive in the new global economy, Ontario will require a highly skilled and adaptable workforce. We know this. We did not have to read it in yet another report.

This report, 1990—I will give members an example—says that “shortages of skilled persons who are capable of working with the new technologies being introduced into offices and plants encountered by employers in the 1990s will persist.” The old one says in 1988, just two years ago, “In the years ahead, Ontario's employers face a prolonged period of labour shortage.”

Why should the citizens have to reproduce a report giving the same recommendations? Yet what do we see from the government? No action on important recommendations that will affect their young people and the economy of the country yet again.

ROBERT BURNS

Mr Tatham: Mr Speaker, should auld acquaintance be forgot and never brought to mind?

The best laid schemes o' mice and men
Gang aft a-gley

Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
to see oursels as others see us!

It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
an' foolish notion.

What airs in dress and gait wad leave us
and even devotion!

The Ayr Advertiser and Prestwick Times, Scotland, Thursday 12 April 1990 headline: “Burns Cottage Hits Cash Crisis.” In 1975, 143,000 people paid to visit the cottage. Last year the number was just 66,000. Trustee Colin Kilpatrick says there is not even enough money to buy a new lawn mower. Sixty nine Burns clubs overseas, as far away as New Zealand and the Persian Gulf, are being contacted for help.

And there's a hand, my trusty fiere
and gie's a hand o' thine.

And the words that give my inner heart a cheer are:

Then let us pray that come it may,

As come it will for a' that,

That sense and worth o'er' a' the earth,

May bear the gree, and a' that,

For a' that and a' that,

It's coming yet for a' that,

That man to man the world o'er

Shall brothers be for a' that.

CASE OF JANICE LAROQUE

Miss Martel: In light of the reluctance of the Workers' Compensation Board to accept that there are major problems at the board, I want to raise another case today.

Ms Janice Laroque of Sudbury is a Canada Post employee. Her work on the night shift involves hauling around 50-pound bags of mail, which then requires sorting. She suffered her first injury to the shoulder in 1985. In April 1986, January 1987 and February 1988, Ms Laroque again had to claim compensation because of work injuries. At no time did she have any problems receiving benefits.

On 2 March 1990, Ms Laroque was again ordered off work by her doctor. This time, however, the WCB has decided that the claim cannot immediately be allowed. The board feels there is not enough evidence on file to show that the worker has had ongoing problems; this, in spite of the fact that she has had claims in 1985, 1986, 1987 and 1988. In 1988, for example, she received chiropractic treatment for three months for her injury.

The WCB has decided an investigation is now necessary. It has taken the board 10 weeks to pull together Ms Laroque's other files so that all can be reviewed together. We have no idea how long the investigation will take.

Ms Laroque actually returned to modified work on 7 May, but Canada Post had taken her off the payroll during her absence and it will take six weeks for her first cheque to arrive. She cannot wait that long. Her bank manager has already contacted her regarding the power of sale of her house. Further delays are unacceptable. Ms Laroque should receive benefits now.

1340

LANGUAGE DEBATE

Mr J. M. Johnson: I would like to bring to the attention of this assembly an article that appeared in the Toronto Star on 22 April

1990. This article is a reprint of an editorial published in the *Equity*, a Shawville, Quebec newspaper on 6 March 1890. It is entitled, "I am a Canadian." I will quote the editorial.

"During the progress of the dual language debate, words have been spoken and published in the press throughout the country that will rankle in the hearts and foment ill-feeling between the two races of Canada, a feeling which at the present time is only too strong between the two races in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

"Great responsibility will now rest with aspiring politicians of both races, how they use these prejudices and work upon the feelings of the people in both provinces, for the purpose of gaining their own ends and raising themselves to power.

"It behooves the people of this Canada of ours, French and English, to stand shoulder to shoulder, forgetting the differences of opinion which may exist between us and only remembering the great love we bear for our country, to push forward in the great work of building up a nationality in Canada which shall be able to challenge the applause and admiration of the world.

"Then the time will come in the history of Canada when the proudest words a citizen of this country can utter will be, 'I am a Canadian.'"

These noble words spoken over a century ago are even more important today, and I truly hope that the time will soon come when the proudest words a citizen of this great country can utter will indeed be, "I am a Canadian."

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

Mr Adams: There has been some comment about the cost of operating this House in our two official languages. We are the richest province in Canada and, by many measures, one of the most wealthy jurisdictions in the world. The number of francophones in the province is second only to Quebec.

I want to draw the attention of members to the language services provided in the Legislature of one of the smallest and least wealthy jurisdictions in Canada, the Northwest Territories. The NWT, which has a population of 55,000, operates its Legislative Assembly in four or five languages and, on occasion, at the request of members, in eight or nine. These include Inuktitut, Chippewyan, North and South Slavey, Dogrib and Dene, as well as English and French. Visitors can follow the proceedings in all of these. Our friends in the translation booth here will be interested to know that their translators work from the English soundtrack.

The NWT does not view this multilingual approach to government as an expensive luxury. It sees it as an appropriate and productive means of governing an extremely diverse population.

If the NWT can do this, surely here in the great province of Ontario we can afford, without complaint, to operate this chamber in Canada's two official languages.

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr Allen: Recently, a group from Hamilton has made a proposal to the government to decentralize the Office for Disabled Persons to our fair city. The Minister of Government Services and the member for Wentworth East have both been talked to about this and I understand that they support the idea.

I think it is a great idea. In fact, I have a specific location that I can suggest to them, a beautiful site to the west of Main Street which is ideally located opposite the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. It is right beside the Disabled and Aged Regional Transit System, the disabled transit proposal. It is very near to Chedoke-McMaster Hospital, which has outstanding services for the disabled. Chedoke is internationally renowned for its

prosthetic device development programs. So this would be a great step, I think, for the ministry and for the government.

Not least of all, of course, besides the handsome location, would be that this building would be ready to house them at the appropriate time. It is not the only site, but it is perhaps one of the best that would be available in my riding and give a handsome location in a building devoted to medical and professional services.

Of course, moving outside Toronto would bring great saving for any ministry, inasmuch as the expenditure level of rents and personnel costs and so on would be substantially less than those in Toronto.

I commend this to the ministers and I hope they vigorously pursue it.

JOB ADVERTISEMENT

Mr McLean: My statement is directed to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and it concerns an advertisement that appeared recently in the *Toronto Star*. Judging by this ad, we can assume that the Ontario Lottery Corp is seeking a co-ordinator for government liaison at a salary starting at \$41,796. It appears that the successful candidate who wins this fancy-titled position will also win a substantial lottery prize that starts at over \$41,000.

A closer examination of this ad indicates that this "co-ordinator for government liaison" will "act as a primary Ontario Lottery Corp contact for the provincial government; direct responses to questions raised in the House, in government correspondence and prepare preparations to House committees and responses to committee recommendations; plan and co-ordinate the primary implementation of new legislation."

An ad like this can only leave the people of Ontario with the impression that the minister is looking for someone to run interference for him. He wants to hire someone to do his job for him.

The ad also mentions that the successful candidate will be able to work under pressure and with minimal direction. In other words, this "co-ordinator for government liaison" will be doing all the work while the minister sits back and acts like a tourist in his own ministry. Is the minister trying to be like his colleague the Minister of Health by getting someone to run the show in his ministry? Just who is in charge of the ministry over there?

VANDALISM OF JEWISH CEMETERIES

Mr Daigeler: Ten days ago, more than 30 community leaders and over 500 ordinary citizens from all parties, all levels of government and all walks of life joined me in a spontaneous condemnation of the desecration of Ottawa's Jewish cemetery.

Starting with Ed Broadbent as the new president of the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, key representatives of what this country is all about spoke to denounce racism, anti-Semitism and hate-mongering at home and abroad.

We also wanted to show our support for our Jewish fellow citizens who were visibly hurt and shaken by this shameful attack on their integrity and history. As a member of Ontario's German-Canadian community, I considered it a grave responsibility to act quickly and decisively against any signs of anti-Jewish behaviour.

I am proud that Ottawa's people responded to my call for this meeting with spontaneity and sincere sympathy.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Hon Mr Ramsay: I am pleased today to update the members of the House of a development that will benefit the agriculture industry in Ontario.

This morning, I signed an agreement in principle with the honourable Charles Mayer, federal Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds), for a joint financial assistance program to aid eligible Ontario farmers in 1990. This agreement will provide \$35.2 million towards alleviating the severe financial stress facing Ontario farm families.

Specifically, the federal contribution will be made to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, which in turn will implement a direct-payment program for eligible Ontario grains and oilseed producers. All grains and oilseed production, as determined by the province, including grains and oilseeds fed on the farm, are eligible for this assistance.

The federal government has agreed to provide its funds in recognition of this government's commitment of \$48 million in interest assistance to Ontario farmers, as announced recently in the budget. In addition, negotiations are continuing, on a priority basis, to establish similar programs for the Ontario fur and horticulture industries. I will be providing more details of this agreement to the House in the near future as ministry staff are discussing this proposal with Ontario farm groups to obtain their advice on program details.

Ontario farmers have been under considerable pressure from international trade subsidies, high interest rates and the high value of the Canadian dollar. I am pleased that this government could work in co-operation with our federal counterparts to help Ontario farmers with these difficulties. This reaffirms our commitment towards maintaining a viable and sustainable agrifood industry in Ontario.

RESPONSES

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr Wildman: I would like to respond to the minister's statement regarding the federal-provincial agreement on the grain assistance plan.

I really wonder if this is evidence that the federal government is matching the grants promised by the provincial government in the budget for interest rate reduction. These really are two different programs. One is responding to the pressures facing farmers regarding the free trade agreement, while the other is trying to deal with the problems farmers are facing as a result of the wrongheaded high interest rate program of the federal government.

I really wonder if the minister believes that these two different programs are directly related. But then again, I am sure that the federal minister will appreciate the agreement of the provincial minister and his signing the agreement and will be assured, as we all are, that this minister will keep his word in this case, as he has done so often in the past.

1350

Mr Villeneuve: In response to the announcement today by the Minister of Agriculture and Food, certainly the \$35 million plus from Ottawa is very welcome. Normally we hear this minister and this government finding terrible fault with the government in Ottawa. All of a sudden, \$35 million is given to this government to administer, federal money administered by the province.

The problem here is that a lot of the cropping has already been put in the ground. We have farmers who are now being charged 2.5% to 3% a month for fertilizer, for seed, for herbicides they have used on their crops. It is my understanding that the minister hopes to have money in the hands of farmers some time by September or October.

That is rather late, because about that time we will probably have an election in Ontario, and believe it or not, the Minister of Agriculture and Food's name will be on cheques that will be sent to Ontario's farmers, saying, "Look at how great a job this

government is doing," when indeed it is spending federal money. I want to emphasize that it will be federal money being used in the political process in Ontario.

Everything that farmers can get right now—grains, red meats—is being attacked. The price of grains and red meat is no higher now, and in many instances lower now, than it was 10 years ago. Ten years ago the costs of production were considerably less than they are now. Yet we are asking our farmers to continue to produce to feed Ontario, to feed Canada and indeed to feed the world at a cost that is really charged up to their families. Families are having to work for nothing and board themselves. Farmers always buy retail, sell wholesale. That is the entire problem.

This is but one of the areas of concern where this government has relegated agriculture literally to the back burner in the way of support. They are again paying lipservice and they will be using federal money during an election campaign. I can see it as clear as crystal. The honourable minister will have his name on a cheque, "Look at how good we are," in September or October, and that is after farmers have paid 2.5% to 3% a month on their input costs starting last April.

It is a welcome contribution by the federal government. It will be administered by this government which will try to take credit for it and say how great it is to Ontario's agriculture. It is not right.

Mr McCague: My colleague has referred to the cheques that the minister is going to send out to some of my constituents in the next few days. I can tell the minister that it is not going to work. I do not know why the minister is messing around with the affairs of the stockyards. For instance, I understand that the minister decided yesterday that anybody who was in favour of maintaining the stockyards was let go from the board and is going to be replaced by someone who is in favour of the demise of the stockyards.

The minister has given a great, big slap in the face to a very fragile red meat industry. Do not forget it, because they will not forget it.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Mr R. F. Johnston: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to raise a point about ministerial statements under section 31(c), which indicates, as you probably remember, that "Two copies of each ministerial statement shall be delivered to the opposition party leaders, or their representatives, at or before the time the statement is made in the House."

Recently I have noticed a trend that statements are given to us in advance but then are often embellished in the House. A critic on this side often is reading along in his text, as we were today, and finds that the text that is being stated in the House is not that which is before the critic.

It strikes me that some latitude should be left for the odd minor interjection, but I am wondering if the Speaker has thought about the two tendencies which are taking place: the one is this embellishment without that being part of the written statement and the other is of course the opposition members responding to statements which have not been made, which I remember doing myself once.

The Speaker: I thank the member for his comments. However, he will note that the Speaker does not receive a copy, and therefore I cannot follow along. But I will—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I will certainly make sure that the government House leader reads your comments in Hansard.

The next item will be oral questions. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Reville: Look, the front bench has gone.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. And the question is to whom?

ORAL QUESTIONS

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Mr B. Rae: I was just looking for the front bench. The Minister of Health has just arrived, so I will disappoint her by not asking her a question. In the absence of the Premier, who I had hoped would be here to answer my question, I will go directly to the Minister of Citizenship.

The minister may perhaps recall—it was before he was here—that in 1985 the Liberal Party made a commitment to the people of the province, five years ago, to bring in an employment equity program that would apply to the private sector as well as to government. Five years later, disabled people, just to mention one of the groups that have been discriminated against in a systematic way, are still waiting for action from this government with respect to their rights in the workplace. The unemployment rate among disabled people is as high as 60%.

When is the Liberal government going to live up to its promise, made many times over, that it will introduce legislation ensuring employment equity for people who are disabled in Ontario?

Hon Mr Wong: I am pleased to answer the question of the honourable Leader of the Opposition. Let me remind all members of the House that, during last summer and last fall, the government met with over 100 organizations, including community groups, labour unions, business and public sector agencies, to seek their views on how to effectively implement employment equity for the broader public and private sectors in Ontario. In addition, many briefs have been submitted and continue to arrive.

Let me also say that careful consideration is being given to the input from community consultations and the written briefs on a number of options, including legislation, to enable the government to put forward a comprehensive employment equity strategy which emphasizes a consensus approach.

I might also say that the government has taken many other initiatives—

The Speaker: Thank you. There might be a supplementary.

Mr B. Rae: The American Congress has been considering for some time and has now approved legislation affecting people with disabilities which is far in advance of anything that has been proposed by the Liberal government in this province. Not just the American Congress, but the Mulroney government—the branch plant of the American Congress, if you will—has an employment equity bill which is in advance of anything that has been proposed by the Liberal Party of Ontario. The city of Toronto has an employment equity program with respect to employment and contract compliance which is in advance of anything proposed or discussed by the Liberal government of Ontario.

1400

When is this government going to live up to its rhetoric and do something for those people who have been left out of the world of opportunity, left out of the world of a pay packet and left out of a chance to earn a living for themselves, which they want rather than welfare?

Hon Mr Wong: The honourable Leader of the Opposition uses the United States as an example. In my reading, the affirmative action and other policies in the United States started more than 40 years ago with presidents Roosevelt, Eisenhower,

Kennedy and Johnson. Let me talk about the last five years. In fact, let me talk about the last several years here in Ontario.

In the Ontario women's directorate, provisions have been made for support for the development of employment equity initiatives in the broader public sector and the private sector. In March 1989 there was an announcement by the Minister of Education of goals and timetables for achieving employment equity in the boards of education. In the Ontario public service, on 9 November six months ago, there was another announcement which included a commitment for \$1 million for the 1989 fiscal year to be used to support persons with disabilities, with technical aids, assistive devices and attendant care.

A \$7.5-million fund for—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order to all members.

Mr B. Rae: I asked the minister a question about a law for Ontario. They promised a law back in 1985. It is a commitment that they have not kept. I say to the minister very directly, there are people with disabilities today who are as unemployed today as they were five years ago. The private sector and the public sector have no more obligations with respect to people with disabilities than they had back in 1985. Nothing has changed.

Very specifically, when is the minister going to introduce a law that will finally ensure that people who are labelled as disabled but who desperately want a chance to participate in the workforce are going to get that chance right here in Ontario? When is he going to do it?

Hon Mr Wong: I thank the honourable member for the question. I believe he asked me a similar question two weeks ago. Let me say very clearly that I am currently discussing various options with my cabinet colleagues and we hope to have a comprehensive approach in the very near future.

SOLID WASTE REDUCTION

Mrs Grier: My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Yesterday I asked the minister whether he had any plans to reach his own target of diverting 25% of the province's solid waste from disposal sites. In response the minister said, "We have already achieved at least a 14% diversion of waste in terms of the household waste we see."

What I am sure the minister meant to say was that what he had achieved was 14% diversion of waste from households that have blue boxes, that only slightly more than 50% of the province's households have blue boxes, that household waste represents only one third of the total solid waste generated in the province and that therefore my estimate of the 2% of solid waste that he was diverting was in fact accurate. Is that not what the minister meant to say?

Interjections.

Hon Mr Bradley: Despite the prompting from the mini-benches of the New Democratic Party, I could not agree with what the member has to say other than to say we are certainly seeing a rather significant increase in the amount of activity designed to reduce, reuse and recycle material in various communities across this province.

In addition to those communities, which are growing almost daily, the number of communities coming on to the blue box program grows daily. We are over two million people at this time. A lot of people said we would not have two million households on the blue box program—

Mr R. F. Johnston: How many households are there, Jim?

Hon Mr Bradley: That is at least half of the households in Ontario, to the member for Scarborough West, and it is growing almost daily.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Bradley: "Seeing the communities minute by minute," says the member for Sarnia. It is a program which is growing, a program of course which the United Nations recognized with its environment program award, which—

Mr Brandt: Who started that program?

Hon Mr Bradley: —I know the member would be very proud of, on behalf of the people of this province who have responded overwhelmingly to this program.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon Mr Bradley: We have had that kind of massive support for it, communities coming on one after another, and the people—

The Speaker: Thank you. Supplementary.

Mrs Grier: I agree entirely with the minister that the blue box program is a good program and has been a successful one. The point I keep trying to make to him is that it is only part of what needs to be done and that even though it is a good program, it is not in fact capturing as much of the waste as it ought to be capturing.

Let me give the minister some more information that he sometimes forgets to include in his answers. We all know that he recently surrendered to the soft drink companies by refusing to force them to reduce waste by using refillable containers. In 1989, only 20% of the non-refillable soft drink containers sold in Ontario went into the blue boxes. In 1990, it is estimated that 32% will go into blue boxes. In other words, two out of three non-refillable soft drink containers will go to disposal sites or will continue to litter the countryside.

The minister has ruled out refillable bottles. He has ruled out a deposit system. Can he tell us what plans he does have to deal with this, which is a simple part of the waste disposal puzzle?

Hon Mr Bradley: The member refuses to recognize what people in a number of other jurisdictions have recognized, and that is that we in Ontario are leading in diverting waste from our landfill sites and from our incinerators. I mention as well to the member that we have 130,000 home composters that have been funded, plus a number of communal projects.

Mr Reville: Big deal.

Hon Mr Bradley: The member for Riverdale says, "Big deal." I think a lot of people in this province who have watched the growth of composting, who have seen the individual participation by people within communities and the individual communities themselves that have, let's say, region-wide or city-wide or town-wide composting facilities would think that is extremely important, because it is estimated that about 30% of household wastes are in fact compostable materials.

We are seeing this grow on a daily basis in terms of the capturing of this material. We have people from the European Community looking at our system in Ontario with a view to emulating it because they recognize how successful it has been. What we look for in Ontario are practical results, and that is what we are getting.

Mrs Grier: The minister is getting practical results from individuals who want to participate and who want to do what they can, but they represent only a very minor proportion of the waste that is generated in the province.

Why will the minister not come to grips with the need to look at the root cause of our garbage problems, which is that we produce too much waste? Why will he not recognize that he has to produce a program that is going to reduce the amount of waste we generate, not merely divert it to other disposal methods? When is the minister going to spell out a comprehensive policy and program to deal with waste reduction—

The Speaker: That is three supplementaries. Thank you.

Mrs Grier: —not merely waste diversion?

Hon Mr Bradley: I make reference to the fact, as the member will recall, that the environment ministers of Canada put forward a task force, which included representatives of government, people from environment groups and industrial groups, to come forward with a national packaging protocol which would have the effect of reducing the amount of packaging produced in this country. Some rather favourable reviews of that took place when the ministers met in Vancouver, when officials got together when it was announced.

I know it may not satisfy the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore. She is a member of the opposition. Were I sitting in the opposition, I would be asking questions as she does. That is her role and responsibility. I asked those questions for eight years. Now we are in fact, I tell the member, implementing those programs. When I look at the industrial 3Rs program, when I see new wood waste facilities coming forward for the recycling of wood, when I see that some communities now include corrugated cardboard, when I see the plastics now being recycled—

The Speaker: Order.

1410

LANDFILL SITES

Mr Harris: I have a question as well for the Minister of the Environment, about what is surely a province-wide waste management crisis. I am referring specifically to the lack of landfill sites or incinerators. Simply put, we are out. Two and a half years ago, the minister said at least 160 municipalities would run out of landfill space by 1990. As of January of this year, he has approved only five new landfills since taking office in 1985. Within a couple of years up to 300 Ontario municipalities will have no place to put their garbage. What are they going to do with it?

Hon Mr Bradley: This, of course, is the contradiction that we see in the Progressive Conservative Party. One day they are getting up asking, "Why don't you make it more difficult to locate landfill sites?" and the next day the new leader gets up and says, "Why don't you make it easier to locate landfill sites in the province of Ontario?"

Mr Pouliot: Five years in Marathon.

Hon Mr Bradley: I say, and I know the member for Lake Nipigon is also agreeing with the member for Nipissing, that in fact he would like to see more landfill sites approved more quickly. Apparently, that is what he is saying back there anyway, which again does not always jibe with what the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore is saying, so it is interesting to watch this happening.

We have a number of waste management master plans under way in Ontario which are in fact identifying the most desirable sites for those materials which are left over after diversion has taken place. I know that a number of municipalities are working hard, with some guidance and assistance from the Ministry of the Environment, and I am confident that we will be able to deal with all of these matters in partnership with our municipal friends.

Mr Harris: The minister, in response to these questions, gets up and brags about all the things he has done. The fact is, despite all that bravado, there is no way on earth, short of hijacking the approval process, that he now has enough time to find enough landfill sites to meet Ontario's needs. The sad thing is this is not a new problem.

The minister knew in 1985 that he had a five- to seven-year window when he came into office, and the results are there for all to see five years later, that he has failed to do his job. Again, I ask

the minister, we have insufficient landfill or incineration facilities, we have no time to approve what we need, we have a province-wide garbage crisis that is growing every day. How is he going to avert an environmental catastrophe, literally, when the clock stops ticking on the existing sites?

Hon Mr Bradley: If indeed the new leader speaks for the Progressive Conservative Party—and I must assume that he does. He was elected at its leadership convention and so he does speak for the party. I look at that now and I say that the person who ordinarily would be sitting behind him, the member for Mississauga South, has been critical in the other direction on a number of occasions. I think he has to be consistent in this regard. He has to say whether he would like us to abort the process. That is what he seems to be saying.

We are working with municipalities all around Ontario. I know that in the past when the previous government has approved sites, this government and the taxpayers of Ontario have been forced to pick up the tab for sites which were identified in the manner in which the new leader of the Progressive Conservative Party is suggesting now. We want to ensure, through this process, that in fact we are not going to encounter those problems, the Pauzé-type problems that existed in the province when the member's government was in power. That is why we have established the present process. We will, through our various efforts—

Mr B. Rae: You don't have the same rule for Metro, my friend. Ask people in Whitevale about how fair your system is.

Hon Mr Bradley: The member for York South is interfering—

The Speaker: There may be a supplementary. You might have something to add then.

Mr Harris: I am always intrigued that the Minister of the Environment, when he does not have the answers to these questions and has not had for five years, now starts looking elsewhere. I would be glad to come over there and give him the answers. I would be glad to provide them. I do not have enough time today to point out all the things that the minister should have been doing. But we have been mentioning them, like streamlining the approval process so it does not take six to 10 years—I am happy to point that out; I think we all know that—like providing leadership instead of pitting municipality against municipality and neighbours against neighbours, like mandating tough new packaging regulations that are required to reduce and reuse products so they do not end up in a waste stream. I wish I had more time to give all the answers that the minister needs. We know he should have been doing those.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Harris: So we know what the minister has not done. What the people of Ontario want to know today, and it is a pretty straightforward question, I believe, is where do 300 municipalities put their garbage when Ontario runs out of space within the next 18 months to two years.

Hon Mr Bradley: They will have the kind of facilities which will be environmentally acceptable facilities as opposed to the kind of facilities that the previous government provided. In fact, we may say that Pauzé is the essence of the landfill policy of the party which is the third party in this House at the present time. We have lots of those examples around this province that our remedial plans have to look after in terms of funding because we all remember the way the Tories used to locate landfill sites and facilities in this province.

We are not doing that at the present time. We are in fact having municipalities work together. We have municipalities, for instance, now working together as counties, looking at their problems county-wide and working together, or as regions or as

groups together, something that never happened when the Conservatives were there. When they were in power, they were spending some \$750,000 on diversion. In fact, this year we are now spending approximately \$55 million in this province on the 3Rs, something that their government never, ever considered.

EDUCATION FINANCING

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Premier. Section 209 of the Education Act specifically requires that school boards cover off their previous year operating deficits. The Premier would also be aware that the Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association, in a recent survey, found that almost half of their separate boards in this province are reporting year-end deficits for 1989, totalling over \$45 million. In January 1989, the then Minister of Education made some very strong statements about the need to comply with Ontario law. He said if boards cannot balance their operating budgets as submitted, then surely they do not have the ability to fund the local share of their capital allocations either.

Since the current Minister of Education has been deathly silent on this issue, what has changed the mind of his government in one year, where it has taken such a strong stance in compliance with the law and yet now he has allowed his minister to be deathly silent on this important issue?

Hon Mr Peterson: This minister has never been silent on any issue, and he is happy to tell the member the answer.

Mr Laughren: That's true.

Hon Mr Conway: I have to agree with both the Premier and the member for Nickel Belt, for my reputation regrettably precedes me. I would want to say to my learned friend the member for Burlington South that what the Education Act holds and what my predecessor, the member for Wentworth North, indicated is very much the order of the day.

1420

Mr Jackson: The minister would be aware that this practice is actually increasing in activity in this province. The number of boards that are not complying is growing. In the Peel region, for example, the public boards set a 17.3 per cent education tax increase for 1990, and the coterminous separate board, which traditionally matches its tax rate increase, did not. They set theirs lower, at 16.5%, even though they now project a \$10.1-million operating deficit which is accumulating for 1990. This is a clear indication that they are not going to comply with the Education Act and that this practice is growing in Ontario.

Again, my question to the minister is, what is he prepared to do as the minister? As his predecessor made some clear statements, what is the minister prepared to do to ensure that school boards comply with the act and that separate and public school ratepayers are protected in this province?

Hon Mr Conway: My friend the member for Burlington South would know that in the year just beginning—that is, the fiscal year 1990-91—the province has announced, in fact announced some months ago, very generous levels of increase in the operating grant to school boards, 8.7% year over year overall. We are adding another \$363 million to support the operations of Ontario's school boards. At the ministry, we are looking as well at the budgetary estimates that are coming in from various school boards, and we intend to work very constructively with the school boards in the province which appear to be having some difficulty. I can assure my honourable friend that we will do everything we possibly can in a constructive and in a helpful way to ensure that the needs of the community are met and that the requirements of the Education Act with respect to deficit financing are obeyed.

Mr Jackson: In spite of the minister's own belief that his government has been generous, the number of double-digit tax increases for school boards, public and separate, across this province is growing. They are growing at an alarming rate. What we have here is a question not on the government's so-called generosity but on the issue of compliance with a basic law.

I am telling the minister that in a recent conversation with Keith Fletcher, chief grants officer from the ministry, he said, "The Education Act expects you to prepare a budget that goes to the ratepayers with your requirements for the current year." He went on to say, "I cannot help you in speculating on what's going to happen." He thought the Minister of Education "may be forced to make a public statement on the issue. I don't know what will occur. It should be interesting to see what happens next." Within the minister's own ministry, there is concern because they do not have direction on how he is going to get boards to comply with the legislation.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Jackson: My question is this: Why is there an apparent lack of leadership from the minister's government on this sensitive issue, given that we now have a double standard, not for the children and their education but for the taxpayers between separate and public boards in this province?

Hon Mr Conway: I would say to the House and my friend the member for Burlington South that he should not confuse his mischief-making with a want of leadership on this side. The rules of this House, of course, almost encourage members of the opposition to take their idiosyncratic view of what is going on. I cannot help him in that except to say that I expect that the Education Act will be concurred in.

I know the people of Ontario. I have had the honour to serve here for 15 years, and I want to say that in that 15 years I have found the people of Ontario, and particularly the people in the school community, to be very law-abiding. I cannot believe that my friend the member for Burlington South would imagine that there are people in the school community who are not going to meet the needs of their students at the same time as taking the tough management decisions that we are all elected to take, some at the provincial level and others at the local level. I cannot really help my friend beyond that, though I am sure he might have more to say outside later.

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr B. Rae: I have a question to the Minister of Labour about the strike that is taking place in Timmins between the United Steelworkers, the miners, and the Placer Dome mine. It is unusual, to say the very least, for the employer of a mine of this size—there are hundreds of employees at this mine—to be trying to keep the mine open and operating in the course of a legal strike. Nevertheless, that appears to be the decision of the employer. Students have been brought across the line in vans, and one student last week had his hand crushed while working in the mill.

First off, will the minister send in his inspectors right away with respect to the health and safety of that operation? Surely, on the face of it, it is absurd to have people working in those conditions without any kind of training whatsoever.

Hon Mr Phillips: When I was made aware of the fact that it might be possible students might be involved in the operation of the mine, I asked that we keep a very close eye on that particular matter in terms of safety. I want to assure the House that we will continue to do that. I think it is important for all of us to rest assured that our Ministry of Labour people will be watching with the safety of the workers specifically in mind during this particular labour disruption.

Mr B. Rae: It is very hard for me to understand, looking at the mining situation across northern Ontario, how the minister can stand in his place and sanction that kind of decision by an employer. With a mine that size and with the kind of implications it has, I find it very hard to understand why the minister would not be standing in his place today saying that he intends to do something about it to ensure that replacement workers are not brought across the line.

The minister will know that just two nights ago a worker was injured on the picket line, hit by a car. He hit the windshield, was knocked out, woke up in the hospital and said he had no memory of what had happened while he was on the line. This is clearly a very dangerous, volatile situation. I want to ask the minister why he will not introduce legislation right away in this House, to ensure a degree of safety and security on the line, that where we have a legal dispute in a mine of this kind replacement workers cannot be brought across to do work that is already being done by the members of the bargaining unit.

Hon Mr Phillips: I know it is a subject of some considerable interest to the official opposition, but I think if we look at labour relations in this province we have a history we should be proud of. Certainly as I look at the respective bargaining power between the two parties, as I look at the history of labour relations in this province and as I look at the relationship between our union movement and the employers of this province, yes, there are disputes, but by and large I think we have a labour relations environment in this province to be proud of. Therefore, in terms of significant changes in our labour relations law, I think we should look long and hard before we look at significant changes.

I think the labour relations environment in this province by and large is extremely good. I think we would look seriously at significant changes one way or the other, but we would look at them carefully because I do not think anyone disputes, as we look at jurisdictions across North America, that this is one jurisdiction that seems to be working well. What the official opposition is proposing is a significant change in it. Therefore, while we are always looking for improvements, I think we have to be very careful about significant changes that disrupt that fairly delicate, but none the less effective, balance.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr Runciman: In the absence of the government House leader, I will direct my question to the Premier. It has to do with what we in the opposition parties are perceiving to be a stalling effort on the part of the government members on the standing committee on general government.

Mr D. S. Cooke: It is not a perception; it is a reality.

Mr Runciman: It is a reality. The Premier is aware of the standing order changes made some time ago which were to facilitate the operations of this Legislature. One of the elements of those changes was to provide the opposition parties with an opportunity to have matters referred to standing committees.

As the Premier is aware, our party made reference in respect to the stoppage of a commission of inquiry into the planning and development of land in York region at his office. Up to this point we have been frustrated in our efforts to have this heard. Initially the member for Yorkview tried to have the matter deferred; it was ruled out of order. Then this matter was appealed to you, Mr Speaker, and now the member for York Mills is refusing to attend meetings to schedule witnesses.

Can the Premier explain why his members are taking this action?

1430

Hon Mr Peterson: This matter is in the hands of the committee, and as the member knows, the committee orders its own business.

Mr Runciman: It is an effort here, quite clearly, on the part of government members, operating on a clear direction from somewhere, to stall this matter until it cannot be dealt with in a full manner. Obviously the government has something to hide here. We are attempting to get to the facts, and we are being shut off at every turn. The changes in the standing orders were made with the agreement of all three parties in this Legislature to facilitate the operations, and now at the first opportunity for the opposition to have a matter referred, we are being frustrated by the government members' on this committee stalling tactics to cover up.

The Speaker: The question?

Mr Runciman: Will the Premier commit himself to making certain that members of that subcommittee on his party's side are prepared to meet this afternoon, and if not this afternoon, tomorrow at the latest, to arrange a schedule of witnesses so we can get on with our business?

Hon Mr Peterson: —ordered by the committee and by the House leaders and I will be happy to pass on his very thoughtful and dispassionate views on the matter.

BALLET OPERA HOUSE

Mr Owen: I have a question for the Minister of Culture and Communications. Some time ago, this government made a commitment to the support of a Ballet Opera House in Toronto, and more recently, Toronto itself has also indicated its support for the same. Such a performance house is very important to both the Canadian Opera Co and to the National Ballet of Canada in order that they can further their growth and development so that they can work towards becoming world-class companies. I wonder if the minister could share with us today where the federal government stands with regard to its possible support of this project and where that stands with regard to any time limits as to when its support has to be on side or the project is gone. Could the minister please advise us?

Hon Ms Hart: I thank the member for Simcoe Centre for his interest in this issue. Indeed the Ballet Opera House, it is hoped, will be a beacon in this city for the whole nation in the performance of ballet and opera.

As the member knows, the province has committed to support the Ballet Opera House and its support is conditional on a support by the federal government. I recently met with the federal minister, Marcel Masse, and as far as I understand, their commitment still stands. I do not believe there is a firm time when that must occur, but I understand that before summer we should hear something.

Mr Owen: I understand that at the present time the National Ballet, for example, functions out of four different locations in Toronto and that in order to perform at the O'Keefe Centre, as it has been doing for many years, it must treat each session or performance as if it is on a road trip, with all of the difficulties and limitations that would accompany a road trip tour. I understand the same situation applies to the Canadian Opera. The difficulties are almost insurmountable for these companies. They are good, but they cannot become world-class until we co-operate with them and provide the proper venue for them to perform in. I wonder if these circumstances have been communicated to the federal government so it can realize how important the issue is.

Hon Ms Hart: Indeed those circumstances have been communicated to the federal minister, because I have done that myself, but I should say further that the planning process is ongoing for the Ballet Opera House, that construction is intended to begin in 1991, and as far as I know, it is a go.

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr Reville: My question is for the Minister of Health. Here is where this government's health policy has got us: Women and men, old and sick, get wheeled into a closet where they are hosed down. All of us can imagine how we would feel under such circumstances, how dignified we would feel.

Yesterday the minister responded to questions about this matter with the usual platitudes. What can she say to us today? Do people in Ontario have the right to expect dignified treatment from this government?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I was very clear in my answer yesterday that the story that I read on the weekend, as the member opposite did, clearly showed an unacceptable situation. I want him to know that the ministry considers the expansion of Ajax and Pickering General Hospital as one of its highest priorities. We have met with the hospital board as recently as last Friday, and I can assure the member that the planning process is nearing completion and that we hope to have an announcement in a matter of weeks.

Mr Reville: The minister is quite right, it is unacceptable to hose down old, sick people in closets, but that is the inevitable consequence of the goofy health policy that this government has. On the one hand it has stopped building beds, and on the other hand it has barely begun to put into place its community care system. This government is not putting its eggs into any basket. What is it to be? Is it to be a real continuum of institutional and community care, or is it going to be more makeshift showers?

Hon Mrs Caplan: The member opposite is quite incorrect. In fact, our whole capital planning framework acknowledges that infrastructure renewal, which will make sure that both occupational health and safety issues as well as patient comfort and convenience, is considered a priority as one of the four parts of the capital planning framework, as are innovations, specialty care and a responsive approach to demographics.

I can tell him that the capital planning framework has been applauded by communities across this province and, for the very first time in a long time in this province, we are seeing hospitals work together to identify those areas where we can improve both patient and staff comfort as well as safety issues. I want to assure him that those processes are under way right across this province and that this year we will see some \$250 million in capital expenditure, which the Treasurer has very generously allocated for this purpose, and I am pleased to report to the House that that kind of activity will result in improving the facilities in this province for the people of Ontario.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Mr McLean: My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Of 443 proxy votes cast in Tiny township in 1988, 306 were incorrectly completed or altered, 118 were completed with no proxy appointed by the elector but a proxy was not listed by the candidate, 129 were completed with no proxy appointed by the elector but a proxy was not listed by the campaign worker, 21 were completed by the elector and a proxy was appointed by the proxy's name or the date had been altered, 12 had the proxy and the witness as the same person, two were completed in which the elector and witness were the same person and seven were completed by proxies who voted as proxy for more than one person. The report also states that some of the problems experienced were likely the result of recent amendments to the Municipal Elections Act, which meant proxy voting was no longer restricted to ill or absent electors. Does the minister plan on amending the Municipal Elections Act to rectify that problem?

Hon Mr Sweeney: Yes, we share the concern of the honourable member, and he will probably recall that the last amendment to the act came a relatively short period of time before the 1988 election. This was not the only one; there were several, shall I call them, irregularities that occurred. As a result of those, we have done a considerable re-examination of the act. We have already made a couple of changes. We are in the process right now of making a change with respect to proxy, and as the member probably knows, there is a small task force going around the province right at the moment that provides a number of other options that might be made, and in all of these cases we have asked that the changes be recommended to us before the end of this calendar year so they can be incorporated into the 1991 provincial election. So the answer is yes.

1440

Mr McLean: That is exactly what I wanted to hear. If the previous minister had listened to my colleague the member for Simcoe Centre and me when we were dealing with this legislation, there would not have been this problem. So really, my question has been answered and I hope that the reeve of Tiny township now will be able to say that he agrees with the minister, although he has indicated that he does not believe any of the legislation needs to be altered.

I am asking the minister now. He indicates that once the report is in, he will amend the legislation?

Hon Mr Sweeney: What I have indicated to my honourable friend is that there is a significant re-examination of the election legislation, we are in the process of changing a number of things, and what he is talking about is part of the review that is going on right at the present time. The only thing I cannot tell him with any surety is exactly what form the change will take, but in fact there will be changes to that legislation.

PLANT CLOSURE

Mr Adams: My question is for the Minister of Financial Institutions. It is now several months since the Outboard Marine Corp closed its operations in Peterborough, but apparently the distribution of the pension assets of the former employees is still unsettled. My question to the minister is, could he comment on the process used to distribute such funds?

Mr D. S. Cooke: He's asking about pension reform. When is the indexation coming?

Hon Mr Elston: As always, the member for Peterborough has raised a very important question for his constituents, and as usual, the member for Windsor-Riverside has again misunderstood the intent of the question, in fact is unable to provide anything useful by way of comment in the House.

Let me tell the member for Peterborough that his request for information is timely inasmuch as the announced closure has caused a partial windup of two plans at the company. In fact, as I understand it, there was an approval for distribution of benefits given on 11 May and shortly, I suspect, there will be a sending out of request forms to the employees, which they should send back.

Mr Adams: I am grateful to the minister for that response. I think he realizes that this has been a very stressful time for the former employees. As this thing has dragged out somewhat, I wonder if the minister can give me any sense of when all the decisions will have been taken for every employee as to when he or she will be receiving final information on pension matters.

Hon Mr Elston: As I understand it, not all of the employees are terminated at the same time, so that will mean that an answer to that will depend upon termination, obviously, but there will be in the next four to six weeks a sending out of the application

forms that I advised the member of, and those forms obviously should be filled in quickly by all concerned so that the material can be gathered and distribution commenced.

As I understand it, some employees, I think, will be going until 1 June, which is quite soon. As a result, I think the expectation is that within seven months from that time there should be complete dealing with the pension matters at the company.

OLDER WORKER ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mr Farnan: To the Minister of Labour: Two older workers come to my office. Both of them are the victims of layoffs due to bankruptcy. Neither of them has any hope of being rehired or retrained. One of them will be covered by the POWA program, the program for older worker adjustment, and will be eligible for extended benefits. The other will not.

Would the minister tell me how he would explain the inadequacy and the unfairness of the POWA program, particularly to the worker who is denied the meagre benefits of the POWA program?

Hon Mr Phillips: As I explained in the House, I guess probably four or five months ago, the POWA program is a joint federal-provincial program, one that has benefits for some older workers—not all older workers, but some older workers—and I am pleased that we have been able to assist many older workers, including some older workers in the member's riding.

The POWA program is not perfect, as I said in the House before. It is one of the reasons why we were the last province to agree to participate in the POWA program. It is of benefit to many older workers, but it does not benefit all older workers. We had some suggestions for changes. We were unable to get the federal government to necessarily agree to those. As I say, POWA helps many, not all, and I think the member will have to explain to his constituents that it is a program that nine of the other provinces agreed to, we finally agreed to it, and it does benefit some but not all older workers in the province.

Mr Farnan: The minister admits that the vast majority of older workers are excluded from the program. Ontario had a total of 5,496 bankruptcies in the first four months of this year. This is an increase of almost 30% over the same period in 1989. The vast majority of these bankruptcies will result in layoffs of men and women, the majority of whom will not be included under the POWA program.

Given the fact that the minister's predecessor promised four and a half years ago that he would go ahead with provincial legislation—note that, provincial legislation—to protect workers, can the minister tell this House why he has failed to deliver an effective protection for the working people of Ontario?

Hon Mr Phillips: Again, it is a question that has been asked in the House before. The federal government has been indicating to provincial governments that in the case of bankruptcies, which I think all members in the House realize is a federal responsibility, it was its intention to provide wage protection. We have been urging the federal government to do that. Myself and the previous ministers of labour have been urging the federal government to move on that provision for providing wage protection in the case of bankruptcies. It clearly is a federal matter, it clearly is one that the federal government has said it was going to act on, and it is one that we are attempting to hold it accountable for. Too often the federal government is attempting to put on to provincial governments responsibilities which are clearly its.

I hope the member opposite is not suggesting that we back away from those responsibilities and back away from holding the

federal government accountable for the areas where it should be held accountable. That is what we will continue to press to do.

ONTARIO HYDRO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS

Mr Cureatz: I have a question to the Minister of Energy. A week ago Friday, Ontario Hydro made an announcement on Ontario Hydro Environmental Assessments—nuclear generating stations siting studies. I find it passing strange that the announcement was made a week ago Friday just before the House adjourned.

I know I am stowed way up here on the back bench and my learned colleague the member for London North is way down there on the front bench, but I have not lost all my marbles. I just want to bring to the minister's attention: Is it not true that the minister directed Ontario Hydro to make the announcement concerning the siting of future generating stations just before the House adjourned so that she would hope that the Energy critics for the opposition parties would not bring to her attention the fact that—and is this not the case—she is now proceeding with environmental banking for future energy site locations?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I would assure the honourable member that I do not direct Ontario Hydro in its press release function. However, I would recall for the honourable member's benefit that in the environmental assessment hearing that will be undertaken in relationship to Ontario Hydro's plans for electricity supply for the next 25 years, those hearings are to be conducted in two phases. The first phase is looking at determination of need and also the proposals that Hydro has put forward to meet that projected need. The second phase of the hearings is to deal with site-specific approvals for the projects that have been included in the final plan approved in phase 1 of those hearings.

What Hydro has undertaken to do and clearly indicated that it was going to do was to do the environmental assessment work on different sites for different projects that are included in its proposed plans so that when phase 2 of the environmental assessment hearings does begin, that process can be expedited by virtue of having all of the background work as well as consultation in the communities already carried out. That is what they were announcing: they are continuing with that process.

1450

Mr Cureatz: We appreciate the minister's clarifying the announcement. I would like to bring to her attention that my colleague the member for Leeds-Grenville had pursued with former ministers of Energy, as I am with the minister again, the need for environmental banking.

I would like to make it as brief and as simple a question as possible. Is it not now the case that this administration—and we have been pressuring the government to do so—is proceeding on the basis of environmental banking because it is going to take a long process, some two to three years, to get the necessary environmental assessment hearings out of the way? Is it not the case that the minister is actually proceeding with environmental banking so that when she finally reaches the decision-making point of locating a station, she can immediately begin construction?

Hon Mrs McLeod: No, that is not in fact the case. The environmental assessment hearings that will be undertaken on Ontario Hydro's proposed plans have not been undertaken in the province before. They do not involve environmental banking in the sense that any approvals would not be granted for any site-specific projects until phase 1 of the hearings is first of all completed so that there is an agreement on the mix of electricity generation options that will be provided for, and second, the environmental assessment work on projects that are approved in

phase 1 of the plan is fully considered by the Environmental Assessment Board. Until both phases of those hearings are completed, there is no environmental approval for either general proposals or specific projects.

VANDALISM OF JEWISH CEMETERIES

Mr Daigeler: My question is to the Minister of Citizenship. The minister knows about the recent desecration of the Jewish cemetery 10 days ago in Ottawa. Our political and community leaders condemned this outrageous attack forcefully and quickly at a public rally in Nepean. However, the question remains: How can we prevent similar events in the future? In fact, I will be joining a community meeting this Friday to see what we ourselves can do to promote respect and have tolerance among all people of different backgrounds.

Can the minister advise the people of Ontario on his own reaction to the recent signs of anti-Semitism and racism and what his plans are to stop similar occurrences?

Hon Mr Wong: First I would like to thank the honourable member for Nepean for his serious concern and his question. The desecration of the Jewish cemetery in the Ottawa region was a reprehensible, despicable and very terrible act of racism. I wish to inform the honourable member and all colleagues in the House that after the event I personally spoke to and have written to a number of the leaders of the Jewish community both in the Ottawa region and also in Toronto in order to convey the government's abhorrence of this particular incident and in order to exchange views.

Also, I would like to indicate that staff of the ministry in Ottawa has been working with an ad hoc committee consisting of elected officials of all levels of government and also with key members of the Jewish community and members of the minority community groups in the Ottawa region. In addition, our staff has been in contact with senior police officials in the Ottawa region in order to determine appropriate strategies.

Let me conclude by saying that in trying to prevent similar occurrences in the future, we all have to work together. This means community groups, the media, police, government. In fact, all of us have a responsibility in shaping the attitudes to help build a tolerant and understanding society.

Mr Daigeler: I welcome the minister's efforts to promote respect for minorities, whatever their race, colour or religion. There is also the question of proper police protection and intelligence work to uncover the perpetrators of hateful acts. I am wondering whether the minister is working with his colleague the Solicitor General on this matter.

Can he inform us whether our police services are making a special effort to find the people responsible for the recent desecrations and to protect the cemeteries and any other facility that may be threatened?

Hon Mr Wong: To answer the honourable member's question, let me say that I have spoken to my colleague the Solicitor General. His staff is doing everything possible to co-operate. But really, this is a matter for the local level of police. As I indicated in my previous answer, our ministry staff in Ottawa has been in contact with senior police officials in the Ottawa region. Let me say further that our information is that these acts of violence are the work of a few troubled instigators and do not reflect the views of the majority of citizens who join in denouncing this and other despicable racist incidents.

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr Wildman: I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources regarding the ministry's commitment to assisting the communities of the North Shore in response to the devastating

layoffs announced at the Elliot Lake mines and the effects they will have on the economies of the small communities in the area.

Can the minister explain, in the context of the serious economic depression facing the communities, why her ministry has decided it is opportune to transfer jobs away from the Ministry of Natural Resources district in Blind River to Sault Ste Marie district and to move the fire crew from Piche to Ranger Lake at a time when the ministry should be doing the opposite; that is, increasing staffing in the area to help the economy of the local community of Blind River, rather than furthering the economic depression the community is facing?

Hon Mrs McLeod: My understanding is that there was a relocation of fire crews either last year or the year before to Ranger Lake in order to ensure that there is adequate fire crew placement close to the site of anticipated fires. That arrangement basically exists for this coming year, although there has been some further relocation in order to have a detached crew leader available in three different sites, one of which would continue to be Blind River. It is my understanding that two crews of six people, plus one detached crew leader, would remain in Blind River.

I can assure the honourable member that the ministry's concern in its location of its fire crews is simply to ensure that those crews are located in a place where they can be most expeditiously used to fight the fires quickly.

MOTION

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

Hon Mr Offer moved that the following substitutions be made on standing committees: on the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, Mr Laughren for Mr Mackenzie; on the standing committee on government agencies, Mrs Grier for Mr Breaugh; on the standing committee on regulations and private bills, Ms Martel for Mr Morin-Strom.

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Miss Roberts: I have a petition signed by 175 people in my riding. Under the whereases, they respectfully request the government of Ontario provide time for opt-in classes in our public schools for the teaching of Christian religious education and moral ethics to all those students whose parents request it. If this cannot be provided, they request publicly funded Christian schools on the same basis as the Roman Catholic schools.

I have affixed my signature, pursuant to the standing orders.

REUSABLE UTENSILS

Mr Adams: I have a petition here from 300 people in the Peterborough area who are concerned about the environment. In part, it reads:

"We petition the establishment of regulations requiring all eat-in restaurant customers to be served on reusable plates with reusable utensils, and that whatever necessary funding and tax incentives be provided to allow for a smooth transition of these changes; and further, the establishment of a tax on non-recyclable, disposable eating utensils used in retail outlets for takeout purposes, sufficient to provide a reasonable incentive for such restaurants to shift to reusable alternatives; and further, that the proceeds of this tax be used to fund projects and programs to enhance the environment."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT, 1990

Mr Rae moved first reading of Bill 172, the Employment Equity Act, 1990.

Motion agreed to.

Mr B. Rae: As I had an opportunity to explain earlier to people at a press conference, this bill is the result of a long period of discussion and consultation with a number of groups as well as individuals across the province, members active in the visible minority community, the disabled community, women's groups, native groups as well as people from the labour movement.

It is a way of getting this government and this House to focus its attention on the next logical step in creating greater justice and fairness in the workplace and ensuring that it happens. The bill establishes the principle that every employer with a payroll of more than \$300,000 a year needs to develop an employment equity plan, that this plan needs to be discussed with the employees it concerns and, indeed, if there is a trade union, to be negotiated with employees. The bill, as the explanatory note makes clear, also establishes a commission on employment equity and an employment equity board.

Since I see you are about to get to your feet, Mr Speaker, I will say that this bill will be discussed, as I understand it, in rotation on 14 June, and we shall have an even greater opportunity to discuss the principles of the act.

MENTAL HEALTH AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Chiarelli, on behalf of Mr Callahan, moved first reading of Bill 173, An Act to amend the Mental Health Act.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ONTARIO LOTTERY CORPORATION AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Hon Mr Black moved second reading of Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act.

Hon Mr Black: My colleague the Treasurer recently presented a budget that demonstrated the very high priority that government places on protecting and enhancing the environment.

This legislation supports that direction by allowing the profits of the Ontario Lottery Corporation to be used to help protect a clean environment for Ontario's future.

Ms Bryden: Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, is another attempt by the government to pretend that it is going to make some new money available for the protection of the environment. It is purely a public relations bill which offers no guarantee of any new funds. It offers no program on how any money from lottery proceeds, which might be allocated to "the protection of the environment," will be spent. It offers no opportunity for the public to have any say in how such money will be spent. It offers no way in which public accountability will be ensured for such expenditures beyond the usual estimates process for considering and approving all ministerial spending.

Bill 114 is simply a further tinkering with section 9 of the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, which was done in late 1989 under Bill 119. Our party will be opposing this bill as a further piece of deceptive legislation on spending of lottery proceeds similar to Bill 119. Bill 119 is the legislation brought in by this Liberal government in the dying days of 1989, allocating lottery proceeds according to the whims of the provincial Treasurer and the cabinet. Nothing is really designated under Bill 119.

Bill 119 went through in a most undemocratic way in this Legislature. The provincial Treasurer and the cabinet did not get this tax-grab legislation through without very great difficulty. In fact, they had to withdraw two previous bills which the public had indicated it did not like and the Treasurer decided at one stage that Bill 38 should perhaps be postponed and looked at again. Finally, in the dying days of 1989, Bill 119 was rammed through by the top-heavy majority on the other side, who did not seem to be worried about the fact that we were giving up the power of the purse which the Legislature is supposed to have, and we were giving it up to the provincial Treasurer and the cabinet to decide how lottery funds should be spent.

We cited to the government opposite that the Magna Carta guaranteed that there should be no spending without approval by the elected people or by the people who were the advisers to the King. When the barons got together and told the King they would not give him any more support or money if he did not consult them, that established the principle that we know as Magna Carta. But this legislation, Bill 119 and its successor Bill 114, go in the face of that tradition that the Legislature should have control of the spending of all moneys that come into the consolidated revenue fund, and that we do that through the estimates and the appropriation process.

1510

In the case of lottery funds, they are a little different. They are what some people call voluntary taxation. The people who invest in lottery tickets feel that they are investing in them because they think that the purposes to which the funds are put will be good ones and ones of which they approve, and they feel that those funds should be definitely earmarked for certain purposes.

Normally, we do not like earmarking taxes; we like to give the government the full opportunity to decide through its budgetary process how money shall be spent. But voluntary taxes which come in through lottery purchases are something different, and from the very beginning of establishing lotteries in 1975, we decided that lottery funds should be designated for certain purposes.

Honourable members will recall that the Ontario Lottery Corp was established by an act of 1974 and started in 1975. It was originally set up to stem the flow of lottery funds out of the province to things like the Irish sweepstake—not that we have anything against the Irish, but there was the argument that perhaps some of that money should be kept at home.

It was agreed that lotteries—even though some people had misgivings about encouraging gambling, shall we say—to a limited degree, were a method of raising funds from the public to provide assured funding for certain designated areas of activities in the province. These areas were greatly underfunded at the time, and still are, meaning the areas of fitness, culture, recreation and sport. But since these areas were greatly underfunded, the original bill in section 9, at least assured them of the net proceeds raised from lotteries run by the corporation. I think the public agreed with going into lotteries on that basis.

Let me read the original section 9 in the 1974 act setting up the lottery corporation.

“9. The net profits of the corporation after provision for prizes and the payment of expenses of operations shall be paid into the consolidated revenue fund at such times and in such manner as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may direct, to be available for the promotion and development of physical fitness, sports, recreational and cultural activities and facilities therefor.”

Members will note that section 9 in its original version dedicates all net proceeds of the Ontario Lottery Corp to the above-designated activities. Presumably, it covers proceeds from all lotteries operated by the corporation, since no mention is

made of specific lotteries that were operating then and the section 9 has been deemed to apply to subsequently set up lotteries as long as they are operated by the corporation.

However, Bill 119 was the first successful attack on the original dedication of lottery funds to those purposes that I have mentioned. It dropped the dedication of the net proceeds of the lottery corporations to the above activities alone. Bill 119 substituted for it a statement that lottery corporation net proceeds “be available for appropriation by the Legislature” for three purposes.

Let me cite those three purposes: (1) the designated activity of the original bill, (2) the activities of the Trillium Foundation, to which the government has delegated the dispensing of some funds to social service agencies—in passing, I question whether that is a delegation that should not receive more scrutiny from the Legislature and from the people who operate social service agencies. It is a group of businessmen who have set up a foundation to dispense grants to social service agencies, and while I do not question that they have done good work in dispensing funds in some areas, the question of how they exercise that power is still not really subject to legislative scrutiny, and I think the people who are appointed to the foundation are also not subject to legislative scrutiny. So that is an agency that perhaps should be looked at some time by one of the legislative committees, but I am digressing.

The third function under Bill 119 or the third purpose to which lottery funds may be allocated is, in the event that not all the proceeds are used in each fiscal year for items 1 and 2, namely the designated activities of the original bill and the Trillium Foundation, the balance of the lottery proceeds can be appropriated as part of the money appropriated by the Legislature for the operation of hospitals. So that is the third area where the new Bill 119 changed the original section 9.

I may say that section 2 of Bill 119 solved a problem that the government was facing at that time. A goodly amount of unspent lottery proceeds were locked up in the consolidated revenue fund at that time, and without Bill 119 going through, it appeared that the government would not be able to spring those funds and get them into circulation for the purposes it wished to use them for. It had to get Bill 119 through to legitimize some of the allocation of lottery funds in the past that did not appear to fit the original section 9 and also to spring the funds that were locked up in the consolidated revenue fund.

So section 2 of Bill 119 said that all funds paid into the consolidated revenue fund prior to 1 April 1989 which had not been expended before that date should be applied to and accounted for in the public accounts of Ontario as part of the money appropriated by the Legislature for the operation of hospitals in the fiscal year in which the act comes into force—that is, in effect, 1989-90. So I presume that money has been sprung and has been spent on hospitals, but we are not really sure until the fiscal year end results are reported. It has ended as of 31 March last, but until the accounts come out, we are not really sure whether that money was not just used to cut the usual appropriation for hospitals in the fiscal year 1989-90. In other words, we are not sure if any real, new money went into hospitals as a result of section 2 of Bill 119. At any rate, that section is now dead, so we are looking at the effect of Bill 119 on the spending of lottery proceeds that come in from now on.

Bill 119 substituted a completely new section 9 for the original one in the 1974 legislation. It was cleverly worded to appear to be dedicating some funds to the same fitness, sport, recreational and cultural activities as were in the original section 9. In addition, it earmarked some funds for the Ontario Trillium Foundation and the operation of hospitals. In Bill 114, it is adding to the above

list a vague designation, namely "for the protection of the environment," whatever that means.

1520

Both Bill 119 of 1989 and this bill are deceptive because Bill 119 gives the Treasurer and the cabinet the full power to dispense all or none of the Ontario Lottery Corp proceeds as they see fit. There is no guarantee any of the named groups or purposes will get a penny.

The government has cleverly changed the wording of section 9 from "The net profits of the corporation," and I will drop out a few words up until now, "shall be paid into the consolidated revenue fund at such times and in such manner as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may direct, to be available for..." The old section 9 stated the designated activities of fitness, culture, recreation and sports, but in the new bill they dropped that after "to be available for" and put in that the funds shall be available for "appropriation by the Legislature." In other words, they have appeared not to change the allocation of the proceeds, but by adding the words "appropriation by the Legislature" they have, in effect, under majority government, simply made it by the whim of the provincial Treasurer and the cabinet, because that is all that "appropriation by the Legislature" means these days under majority government.

This means that Bill 114 is pretending that the Legislature will have the say in whether some money should be allocated "for the protection of the environment."

Beyond the fact that there is now no guarantee for any of the designated groups or activities, there is no special accountability for the expenditure of the lottery funds so appropriated by the Legislature beyond the usual standing committee on estimates and standing committee on public accounts review after the event. In fact, I am saying that in Bill 114 the vague phrase "for the protection of the environment" is absolutely meaningless.

There is no provision in the bill for any consultation by the government with the Ministry of the Environment or the public as to how any funds that might come in through that source at the whim of the provincial Treasurer and the cabinet should be spent. There is no provision even for any consultation with the Ministry of the Environment as to whether it would be the designated spending ministry if there was any money that came in through that process.

There is no indication whether, if any money did come in through that process, it would not be a substitute for other moneys appropriated for the Ministry of the Environment. In other words, rather than increase spending, it might simply supplant spending that is already planned in the budget for the environment. We know the amounts in the budget for the environment have not been going up at a rate that is encouraging that the ministry is prepared to attack the whole problem of the protection of the environment.

In fact, it is suggesting in this bill an attempt to look after the protection of the environment by possibly dedicating a few dollars from lottery proceeds, which often do not exceed more than \$500,000 a year. What we need for the protection of the environment is absolutely astronomical if we are going to actually protect our ecology and our planet. This funding, so-called in this bill, is absolutely no substitute for a planned program to save our ecology and our planet.

Where has the principle gone that the polluter should pay for protecting our environment? I thought there had been an announcement, I think by the Ministry of the Environment, that we were going to have a clean lottery, or a lottery dedicated solely to protecting the environment. But we have not seen any legislation on that and it seems to be only another public relations announcement. It also seems to be another attempt to say that the

taxpayers should pay for cleaning up and protecting the environment and that business and the polluters should not pay.

Who is going to pay for changing our lifestyles and our habits, which are also polluting the environment? Who is going to change the packaging policies that are adding to the pollution of the environment and the running out of landfill? Who is going to pay for the reduction in emissions that are badly needed to protect our air and our water? Who is going to pay for the actual reduction of emissions which, in the long run, will mean that we have less toxins going into our environment? These are all big problems and they will require big expenditures.

A government which thinks that passing Bill 114 is any answer to the vast problem of the protection of the environment is really just kidding itself that it is doing anything that will be recognized by the public as protecting the environment.

I want to go back to the fact that Bill 119 struck off any guarantee for the designated groups, the fitness, sports, cultural and recreational groups, in our province. I am sure the government is aware that when our party finally persuaded the government that it had to send Bill 119 to public hearings—and I think the other opposition party agreed with us on that. When they did send it out to public hearings, which were held over January and February as well as in the fall—I guess it could not have been in January and February, because Bill 119 was passed in December 1989.

Anyway, during the last several months of 1989, the public hearings on Bill 119 were absolutely phenomenal. Almost 200 delegations asked to be heard. The committee did some travelling and heard delegations in other parts of the province. Many people came into Toronto to make delegations.

1530

The cultural, recreational and sports groups got together into a coalition and made many of their proposals in the form of an organized attempt to show how very valuable all those cultural and recreational groups and their contributions were to our economy. They showed how very valuable they were to the communities in which they operated. They showed how very valuable they were to many of the municipal governments which were trying to operate sports, recreational and cultural programs.

They also made us aware of many new areas into which cultural and recreational grants had been going, but in very limited amounts, areas such as dance and theatre, in order to get across educational messages, or to help prisoners develop their talents by developing plays in prison.

By sitting on that committee I learned about a great many activities that were going on in this province that desperately needed that funding from the lottery corporation. They will not be pleased to see that we have now added a new subject that might be allocated some funds. If they realize the amount is likely to be as little as nothing, maybe they will not feel so aggrieved because they are all in the same boat now.

They are guaranteed nothing from the Treasurer and, of those categories that are mentioned, who gets it will depend on the policies of the Treasurer and the cabinet. I think all of those groups who were mentioned should consider that they are still really not first-class citizens as far as allocation of lottery funds is concerned.

We also learned that a lot of those groups who had been getting small lottery funds were not able to expend them efficiently because they were too small or they spent too much time trying to get their funding. They had to go after it year after year. They did not have full-time staff and so they spent a lot of their time making their proposals available.

A few of them have started to computerize their activities so that at least their mailing lists are computerized and they can get

out appeals for funds in an efficient way. A few of them have decided to get together on purchasing policies and are reducing costs by methods such as that. At the moment it is all really subsidizing many operations that could be a lot more efficient if they had a more stable source of funding and if they had adequate funding to meet the needs they have been set up to meet.

We are very rich in the kind of cultural, recreational, fitness and sport activities that have been going on in this province, many of them operated entirely by volunteers, many of them operated by parents, many of them operated by the groups themselves, such as the baseball teams that do get small grants but still have to do most of the work themselves in the fund-raising area.

All of those groups are really being shafted by this government. They do not see any future growth in their grants and they do not see any future growth in the grants that come from the umbrella councils, like the Ontario Arts Council and the athletics administrators. They are all getting very discouraged on how much they are expected to do and how much the provincial government is prepared to do.

It is more of the downloading that we have been talking about, where the provincial government is ducking out of its responsibilities in these areas and is letting the local people, and possibly the municipal governments, pick up the slack. We all know that the municipal governments have been downloaded in so many other areas that they really have no money for extending cultural, fitness and recreation grants.

Many of them are finding that the programs they run, particularly through the parks and recreation departments in municipalities, contribute a great deal to health and personal wellbeing in the various municipalities. Some of them rely on some volunteer help, with volunteer coaches, but others need money for operating recreation centres and sports arenas and also maintaining the arenas they already have.

I think we all remember the day of the great building of arenas under the Progressive Conservative government. I commend them for starting that initiative in many local communities, assisting them with the building of arenas and stadiums. But again they did not provide very much, if anything, in the way of operating costs. That has been left to the local municipalities or some sort of a sports, recreational or cultural group in the area. The government is not really contributing to the quality of life in this province by cutting out adequate provision for cultural, recreational and sports and fitness grants.

I think that Bill 114 is really just a further step in the march away from a caring government that is concerned about what is going on among the people in our communities. I think if they read the piles and piles of briefs that were submitted on Bill 119 when it was going through, they will become much more aware of what has been happening in this province. With an election facing us, it is time for them to look at their programs in this field and to show they really are interested in encouraging the original designated groups, and money for them is not nearly enough.

If they need money for other purposes, they still have their \$2 billion of extra taxes that they have imposed in the last two budgets before the present tax-free, sunshine, pre-election budget. I think more of that money could have been allocated to a substantial increase in the funding of those community, recreational and cultural groups across the province.

This government has really not kept faith with all those groups that counted on lottery funds as just a little extra stimulus but also counted on umbrella groups that would see that activities in these areas were adequately funded with other grants going to municipalities and sports central organizations, recreational developments and capital spending.

Capital is one of the big areas where we are missing any substantial funding. With the construction industry complaining that there is a slowdown in construction jobs, it might be a good time to do some capital spending on more recreational centres in the area, more sports and cultural centres, instead of spending vast sums on restoring theatres.

Although I think that restorations are very interesting, they are very expensive. We do need more small theatres, small concert halls and small sports complexes to see that people have some place to go besides places where you pay \$50 and \$60 for tickets to get in to a show. That is an area where I think some capital spending might stimulate the economy. It might provide jobs and it might provide new places for young people to go.

It might even contribute to the problem that our young people are not having enough recreational and cultural activities available to them. They are not even able to find a place in Metropolitan Toronto to rollerskate, which is ridiculous. But that sort of healthy activity is something that we really should be promoting if we want to avoid the people going in for drug syndromes and activity that is not healthy.

Mr Laughren: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know that government members would not be very happy to know there is not a quorum, in view of the quality of the speeches being made.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1543

Ms Bryden: I hope the larger audience will be aware of the fact that I am making a plea for all the people in sports, recreation, fitness and cultural activities who are being not only neglected but also given the cold shoulder by this government in its policies.

Mr Speaker, if you will recall, when Bill 119 was going through, our party moved an amendment to it, saying that instead of giving the Treasurer a blank cheque on the allocation of lottery proceeds, he should be required to put all unallocated funds, which were considerable at that time, into a lottery trust fund and that the dispensing of that trust fund should be subject to a committee that would study the needs that have been neglected due to the lack of allocation of those funds over the years.

There is a deliberate policy, it would appear, since the Liberal government came in certainly and probably before that, to not spend all the lottery funds that came in. They were hived away in the consolidated revenue fund and, year after year, there were these unspent sums in there. Yet all sorts of groups were not able to carry on their activities. Various small sports groups had to resort to dances and fund-raising for most of the time of the people operating them, and they were mainly volunteer parents who would rather get on with running the sports activities and the peewee teams and the older teams.

But the amendment that our party moved, that we set up a lottery trust fund to dispense all those funds that actually were sprung in 1988-89, was rejected out of hand. It was rejected like most amendments in this Legislature since the majority government came in. The government does not appear to listen to any arguments for a sensible way of running things and for involving the public in how funds should be spent.

I think these funds had come in through the actions of both governments in underspending them. When it came time to spring them by legislation, the dispensing of them should have been decided by a lottery trust fund. We might have learned a lot about what the needs were in the hearings of that trust fund and it would have been another opportunity to do some planning ahead for both capital and operating expenditures for the kinds of groups people think the lotteries are funding.

It is still evident when we listen to the ads on the lottery draws or look at the ads in the paper that our proceeds help recreational

and cultural activities. People buy the tickets thinking they are doing a good thing, but they do not know that practically none of that money will go to the purposes for which they thought they bought their tickets. I think it is fraudulent for the government to still advertise on its tickets or on the ads for them that these proceeds go to cultural and recreational activities because there is no reporting as to how much of it goes to any one activity or how much comes back to each community.

The coalition of groups that came before us did at least think if they were not too demanding and were like *Oliver Twist*, who came asking for more, and if they asked for a guarantee of one third of the lottery funds to go to sports, fitness and recreation and culture, they might get that amendment to the bill. We moved an amendment to that effect as well to get at least a minimum guarantee. That was also defeated by this government. When the next election comes, the government is going to have to explain why it would not even guarantee one third of approximately half a million dollars that was available in lottery funds. The government would not even guarantee one third to all those various activities in the communities.

I think we have reached an area where we need a lot more acceptance of consultation by the government in the spending of its money. The Treasurer calls meetings periodically, or one of the standing committees has hearings periodically, on what people would like to see in the budget. While this is very commendable, it used to be that most of the people who came to those committee hearings were from the business world. What they want to see in the budget, of course, are more and more tax concessions for the business world. I think they are getting that from the Liberal government right now.

Some ordinary groups of individuals wanting grants for cultural and recreational purposes did come and their briefs were politely received and listened to, but I do not see any evidence in the Treasurer's budget when it comes to appropriating further moneys for both the capital and the operating expenses of culture, recreation and fitness.

In fact, tomorrow is Participation Day, where we are all supposed to participate in some sport. We should do our push-ups right now. It is no good the Premier running around in his track suit, showing that he is participating, when his government is not participating at all in the development of healthy sports activities for people.

I think one reform that this government should consider is to make it mandatory that if grants are given to any sports and recreation cultural group for a capital structure, and we do need some, a certain amount should be set aside for maintenance costs every year. Members will remember that we have had a few arenas which collapsed from the weight of the snow on them because they were not properly maintained, and it was left up to the municipalities to find the money to maintain them. This is another area where the government's policy on any spending under Bill 114 should be combined with a clause that anything that is spent on capital should have provision for a minimum maintenance grant as well.

Mr Laughren: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Could you indicate whether or not there is a quorum?

The Deputy Speaker: We will soon do that.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is not present.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1557

The Deputy Speaker: A quorum is present. The member for Beaches-Woodbine may resume her speech.

Ms Bryden: I am glad that I have got a new audience each time. Maybe it is possible to persuade some of them of my point of view.

Mr Speaker, I have told you that our party will vote against Bill 114 as being another deceptive bill intending to show that the government is doing something about the environment, but we have no idea what it is doing except getting a public relations statement on to the record before the presumably imminent election. So I would like to simply urge all members to reject this really vacuous piece of legislation which does nothing to improve the image of the government as being interested in the protection of the environment.

Mr Elliot: I would like to react just a bit to the comments made by the honourable member with respect to Bill 114. Having chaired the standing committee on general government on Bill 119, which was the basis for most of her talk, I would like to point out from the Chair's point of view at that time the submissions that I heard were far different, in my interpretation, from those given to the chamber today.

I have long been involved with the Ontario Municipal Recreation Association, way back into the 1970s, and have followed the advent of the lottery bills and that type of thing for the past 15 years or more. As past president of the Oakville Art Society and a number of other associations like that, the availability of funds now, under this present government, with respect to culture and recreation and other areas like those is far in excess of anything that we would have anticipated when we brought in these ideas 15 years ago.

I am very happy with respect to what I heard because the other thing about that is we got a commitment from the Treasurer in committee. He came to the committee on the last day and indicated to us that there would be absolutely no cutback and actually made a pledge on the public record that the present level of funding from the lotteries would be maintained for at least the next three-year interval of time. That is exactly the kind of statement that I want to hear as a member of the government.

One of the reasons I am in government is to allow groups like the Oakville Art Society to plan down the road a little farther than they have been able to do up to this point in time, because up until this government took over it was a year-by-year scenario. Now, in most of the programs that we administer, the people know where they are going for the next three, five, even seven years. I think that what I heard relative to Bill 119 was entirely positive.

I hope to get a chance to talk a little bit about the environmental aspect of this particular piece of legislation a little bit later in the debate.

Mr McLean: I was not going to comment on the member's speech this afternoon, but after the last member got up I thought I had better. I want to relate to the member for Halton North that I happened to be on that same committee and now I am not so sure that he was on the same committee I was. To indicate to this Legislature that most of the people were in favour of Bill 119 is totally reversed; 90% of the people were opposed to Bill 119. Wherever he was, sitting there as chairman, he could not have been listening. I am sure the member for Beaches-Woodbine will concur with what I am saying here as the facts.

Mr Laughren: I wish to commend the member for Beaches-Woodbine for a very excellent presentation to the assembly this afternoon on this bill.

I too sat on the same committee, the committee that the member for Halton North chaired, and I have no idea what he was listening to during that debate. He must have had his Walkman plugged into his ear, because the people who came before the committee were, without exception as I recall, opposed to the bill. I know that the member for Halton North has a special

affection for lotteries, for reasons we will not go into this afternoon, but it seems to me that he is totally and absolutely wrong when he talks about the people who came before that committee. There is no question that people were opposed to that.

I know that he was very pleased when the Treasurer came before the committee on the last day of the hearings and said that he would not cut back any of the moneys to cultural and recreational organizations. But I would tell members that that is the same Treasurer who a couple of years previous to that withdrew Bill 38 and said, "There's so much opposition in this minority Parliament to the changing of what is known as section 9 of the act"—which would have put all of the money into the consolidated revenue fund—"that we will withdraw the bill." But what happened as soon as the government got its majority? Zap, back came the Treasurer with his desire to make sure that the funds did not all go into culture and recreation, which the legislation had said that they should.

Mr Farnan: I have listened with great interest to the speech given by my colleague the member for Beaches-Woodbine. I simply want to say that the member for Beaches-Woodbine has been an extraordinarily strong advocate for culture and recreation within the province of Ontario. I look back over the last three years and I cannot think of another member in this assembly who has devoted so much energy and such commitment on behalf of the sports and cultural groups of Ontario.

As the Liberal government has to a great degree abandoned sports, culture, fitness and recreation, it has been the voice of the member for Beaches-Woodbine that has been bringing this issue to the fore, making the province aware of this betrayal, because within the original act there was a very specific designation of funds for culture and recreation. We have seen, as the member so very clearly pointed out, the erosion of the importance placed upon culture and recreation within Ontario.

I am glad that the Minister for Tourism and Recreation was here to listen to the comments of the member for Beaches-Woodbine. It is too sad that his voice is not sufficiently strong at the cabinet table to protect culture and recreation in this province, but I want the minister to be assured that, with the support of the member for Beaches-Woodbine and the New Democratic Party, we hope that we can encourage him to get that support at the cabinet table.

Hon Mr Black: Let me comment very briefly. I appreciate the comments from the member for Beaches-Woodbine. I know of her sincere interest. I know it was not her intention to mislead people, but she did in fact state some things that were not quite correct.

There has been only one other prior bill which was introduced; that was Bill 38 and it was withdrawn. She is quite correct in saying that. Bill 119 actually returned power to this Legislature because in the past, prior to Bill 119, interprovincial lottery funds were not restricted by statute. Since Bill 119 has been passed they are.

However, I think it is important that we recognize we are not debating Bill 119 here today. We are debating Bill 114, the bill that is presently before us. Although it is interesting to hear the rehash of history from members of the NDP and the Conservative Party, I think we should more properly focus our attention on the legislation which is in front of us and which does in fact strengthen the environmental thrust of legislation in this province.

Ms Bryden: I am very pleased that other people who sat on those general government committee hearings seem to have had a different version of what went on in the committee than the chairman. There certainly was a very strong number of

delegates, a very large number, almost 200, and of those I would say 95% were opposed to the legislation because most of them thought it was really an undemocratic kind of action by the government and Bill 119 did amount to a retroactive expropriation of the previously unexpended lottery funds. What happened to them was they all presumably went to hospitals. Whether it increased hospital funding or not we do not know.

There were a lot of things in Bill 119 that we think are being repeated in this bill. The government is still not putting into the legislation, and it could have been this bill, the guarantee that the provincial Treasurer is supposed to have given the committee in the last days of its sittings, that there would be no cutbacks. He did not say anything about a cost-of-living bonus, of course, and most of them are suffering inflation rate increases in their costs.

I think if we had seen any sort of commitment in this bill, which after all is opening up the act again, to guarantee the sports, culture and recreation groups some sort of minimum allocation of funds, we would at least have felt that the Treasurer was not just playing games with us at that committee meeting and that it was worth opening up the bill for that purpose. To open it up just to add the words "protection of the environment" is, I think, simply wasting time and I am surprised that the minister thinks that is a very important bill.

Mr McLean: I am pleased to have this opportunity to say a few words concerning Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. As members already know, section 9 of the act now provides that net profits of the Ontario Lottery Corp are available to be appropriated by the Legislature for the promotion and development of physical fitness, sports, recreational and cultural activities and facilities, as well as for the activities of the Ontario Trillium Foundation. This bill would amend section 9 to provide that the net profits of the Ontario Lottery Corp are also available to be appropriated by the Legislature for the protection of the environment.

Bill 114 "does not amend the existing scheme, set out in section 9 of the act, for dealing with net profits of the corporation that are not specifically appropriated by the Legislature. Under this scheme, any part of the net profits of the corporation in a fiscal year of Ontario that is not appropriated by the Legislature in the fiscal year for the abovementioned purposes is to be treated as part of the appropriation made by the Legislature in the fiscal year for the operation of hospitals."

We have here with Bill 114 an example of this government continuing to divide up the pie—in this case, the net profits of the Ontario Lottery Corp—into smaller and smaller slices, when that pie has already been cut up far too often. In the spring of 1989 the throne speech of this government announced that a new lottery fund, Cleantario, would be established to help finance our ongoing efforts to protect the environment.

Then one year later, on 21 March of this year to be exact, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation introduced Bill 114, which he claims will make that promise a reality. The Ontario Lottery Corp plans to introduce a new game called Clean Sweep. That is in conjunction with this initiative. According to Treasury officials, this new game is expected to generate net profits of approximately \$20 million in its first year, 1990-91, and about \$30 million annually thereafter. You see, it is not a separate bill at all; it is all part of that pie that I am talking about. The pieces are getting smaller and smaller.

In essence, Bill 114 is very similar to a previous bill, Bill 119, which was passed by the House last year and provides hospitals with a slice of the lottery profit pie, which continues to grow smaller all of the time. Bill 114, like Bill 119, is an exercise in pseudo dedication, which has become a small but important part of this Liberal government's policy. For example, Bill 114 and

Bill 119, the tire tax, fishing licences, the gas guzzler tax and the employer health tax are an extremely mixed bag, but they all have one thing in common. They are all examples of how this government uses the implied dedication of revenues to justify tax grabs and other unpopular policy decisions. Yes, I think we all agree that the environment and health care have emerged as two primary targets for pseudo dedication under this government.

Mr Laughren: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I wonder if you could tell me if there is a quorum.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is not present.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz) ordered the bells rung.

1612

Mr McLean: After the third quorum call this afternoon, it seems that the Liberal members are not as dedicated as they should be to this Legislature. I find that absurd. Yesterday there were six members here at one time. The disrespect for this Legislature is very, very unkind.

I want to continue on with my speech. This government has apparently concluded that it can extort unlimited sums of money from the taxpayers simply by saying that the unlimited sums of money are for a clean environment and a world-class health care system. That is what they claim they can do. The same government is willing to hold the taxpayers hostage to their concerns about the ecology and about the sick.

The irony of this situation in general, and with Bill 114 in particular, is that none of those taxes or levies are dedicated at all. They simply flow into the huge pot of money called the consolidated revenue fund. The way these taxes, levies and Bill 114 were announced, and the record used by the government in defending them, certainly created the impression that these green taxes and health taxes were somehow special, but they are not.

I think the people of Ontario are clever enough to see through the government's underhanded scheme. They know that green taxes or health taxes are simply used by this government as a means for digging deeper and deeper into the pockets of the taxpayers.

Once again, we see the policy of this government in action. Bill 114 does not earmark or dedicate the net profits of the Clean Sweep game to environmental projects at all. Again, like Bill 119, we see that Bill 114 simply says that the net profits of the corporation shall be available for appropriation by the government for these purposes as it sees fit.

I think it should be noted also that lottery profits for the current fiscal year are projected to be about \$493 million. That is an increase of only \$2 million, or 0.4%, relative to the 1989-90 interim levels. Clearly, the new game will not generate an increase in total net profits of \$20 million or \$30 million.

With Bill 114 we see that the lottery pie will now have to be sliced up once again. That pie will be eight pieces pretty soon. It used to be that we got six big pieces; now we are getting eight smaller pieces. This means that there will be less money available either for the promotion of sports, fitness, recreation and culture, for the Ontario Trillium Foundation or for health care. Clearly, the portion of the net profits directed to the environment cannot also be directed to other purposes and functions.

I think it is well known—it is a well-known fact—that in the past I have attempted to amend bills such as Bill 119 and had amendments to the Retail Sales Tax Act, which, among other things, imposed the tire tax, to ensure that moneys raised were specifically dedicated for the purposes specified. These amendments were not accepted by the government, but I am a determined man, and therefore I plan to try to have Bill 114

amended to ensure that the funds actually are used to protect and preserve the environment and are used to encourage the acquisition and development of green spaces. I plan to move an amendment that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following subclauses:

“(c)(i) That net profits appropriated pursuant to clause (c) shall be paid into a special fund to be established in the Ministry of the Environment for the financing of programs and initiatives to protect our environment and to conserve the natural heritage of the province, and that the revenues and expenditures of the fund shall be accounted for in the public accounts of Ontario;

“(c)(ii) That in any fiscal year a minimum of 35% of the total net profits appropriated pursuant to clause (c) shall be used to encourage the acquisition, conservation and development of green spaces, including park lands, forests, valley lands, waterfronts and wetlands.”

That is my amendment, and I would hope that the minister will see fit to give it every consideration that is possible.

Lottery funds were originally intended to support sports, recreational and fitness and cultural programs and activities. These activities are badly in need of funds, and this government has either discontinued, appropriated or flat-lined alternative funding mechanisms. Then, with Bill 119, the government added hospitals to the list. Now, with Bill 114, the environment has been lumped in with all the others that are dividing up this pie.

Once again, Bill 114 amounts to unfair, retroactive expropriation of unallocated surpluses. Again, Bill 114 unfairly pits sports, recreation, culture and fitness groups, and hospitals, against our environment for public support. Bill 114 does not provide any guarantee of a minimum funding level or a minimum share of profits, nor does it make any provisions for year-over-year increases in the level of financial support available to all of the groups cutting up the lottery pie.

This government should abandon Bill 114. Failing that, the government should at the very least send Bill 114 to committee, where my suggested amendment could be discussed and hopefully approved.

The taxpayers of Ontario are sick and tired of a government that continues to give them the dickens. Sports, recreational, cultural, health care and environmental groups are sick and tired of having to come before this government with cap in hand, asking, “Please, sir, I need some more.” We are all sick and tired of the government giving us the dickens and not giving us the money.

Remember Bill 119? Somebody mentioned that bill earlier on. We had public hearings in committee. We went on for weeks in public hearings. We had people from Thunder Bay. We had people from Ottawa. We had them from Hanover, from Windsor, from London. Some 90% of those people who appeared before that committee opposed Bill 119, which was going to have the hospital funds put in part of that lottery pie. Over 90% opposed that.

1620

I was surprised to hear today that the chairman of that committee indicated the people wanted Bill 119. I certainly did not get that from the delegations.

As a matter of fact, I just happen to have a copy of a brief of one of the persons who made a presentation to that committee who was very much opposed, “to express my firm opposition to Bill 119, the proposed provincial legislation to amend section 9 of the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, which is now being referred to your committee.”

I have another letter from another group of patrons headed by the Honourable Pauline McGibbon, “We will place in jeopardy

the preservation and interpretation of our heritage as one of the province's small museums, now struggling to survive with less than 15% of our budget funded by grants from governmental sources." They endeavour to carry out their mandate. They are very much opposed to that previous bill.

If we had the same occasion today to have public hearings on Bill 114, I am very sure we would get the same reception across this province with regard to Bill 114.

Remember there was a tire tax that was brought in that was supposed to deal with the environment? For example, in imposing the tire tax, the government stated in the 1989 budget that proceeds from the tax would help fund efforts to support recycling and environmentally sound disposal. The government was careful not to say just how much of the more than \$40 million a year raised by the tire tax would be spent on those programs and did nothing to counter the impression that every red cent raised by the tax would be so invested.

In defending the tax, for instance, the Treasurer complained about the buildup of old tires at the Tyre King Tyre Recycling dump at Hagersville, which he described as "a substantial environmental menace which has to be cleaned up." As for the tire tax, the Treasurer said, "It's not very long, but it's got to last long enough for the research and facilities to get rid of the tires."

Was this tire tax not for the environment? This very Bill 114, is it not for the environment? There was probably only about \$1.1 million spent on three tire recycling projects in this tire tax, and his total budget for all industrial recycling stood at \$6.5 million. Here they are raising over \$40 million from the taxpayers.

When those 14 million tires at Tyre King burned in February 1990, the government was still spending only \$1.1 million on tire recycling programs. Suddenly the burning question became, what happened to all that money raised by the tire tax?

The Treasurer's first statement left the impression that the province did have a plan for dealing with the old-tire problem and that it was simply bad luck the fire started before the plan was put into action. Bill 114 deals with the environment, and that is what this Treasurer was assessing the people of this province for. It was for a tire tax to clean up these tire and environmental problems. As the Treasurer put it, "We didn't have a chance to get our program in gear before some twit set it on fire." That is what the Treasurer said.

Why did the government put the tax in place before it had the program in high gear? It never had it in gear at all. The answer proved to be that the government did not have any plan or program at all, as the Treasurer later admitted in an interview with the Ottawa Citizen. He admitted that the tax had been slapped on the tires without a specific plan on how the money would be spent. The Treasurer said: "We don't have earmarked revenue. The tax doesn't go into a sock. It can be spent on anything."

That is exactly what is happening here with Bill 114. They are watering down lottery funds to be spent on everything and they want to direct some to the environment.

I did a questionnaire with regard to the environment. One of the most pressing issues in Ontario, the number one concern, 46%, was the environment. The second question I had was, "What is the most pressing issue in Simcoe East?" Forty-three per cent of the people answered, "The environment." The state of health care in Ontario was my third question. I would hate to tell members what that is. It says it has worsened by 60 per cent, so that is what we got on the health care one.

Environmental problems, municipal garbage, was top of the list at 35%. Creation of environmental lottery, separate, 53% of the people said yes, and I agree with the majority of my

constituents; 53% said yes to a separate lottery for the environment.

The government is playing games here with the environment in a lottery poker shoot. It is totally not acceptable.

Greater Ministry of the Environment emphasis on mandatory recycling was 56% of the people. We said, "Who should administer waste management?" We passed a bill here not too long ago to turn it over to the counties; 38% say the municipalities are the ones that should still deal with it.

This Minister of Tourism and Recreation, who is responsible for this legislation, wants to hire a co-ordinator government liaison person. This new person is going to receive pretty near \$42,000 a year. Not only will this new person going to get the substantial lottery prize that starts at \$42,000, he is going to be the co-ordinator for government liaison. He will act as a primary Ontario Lottery Corp contact for the provincial government. He is going to direct responses to questions raised in the House—I would suggest that the minister should answer them, not have a civil servant answer them—government correspondence and preparation to hold committees and responses to committee recommendations. This minister is wanting to have somebody to run the whole lottery corporation, and he is going to be on holidays as the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

Some time ago, there was a letter sent in from a very small municipality with regard to the concern. The letter starts off, "Greetings from Hinterland." It is a little municipality up in the riding that is represented by the Minister of Financial Institutions. He happens to be in the Legislature today. "Our municipality is extremely disturbed by a series of recent developments initiated by the ministry"—that is, the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation—"consolidation of the former central and southwestern regions."

The Minister of Tourism and Recreation has amalgamated the regions in southwestern Ontario. It plays a very important role in this province. Some day I am going to have to ask the minister how the reorganization which has occurred within his ministry, with staffing levels in certain areas being reduced and operations centralized, is going to affect the ability of the citizens of this province to receive the same level of service to which they are accustomed from his ministry. The minister very carefully assures us that Ontario citizens will not be adversely affected by this reorganization. He does not seem to be as successful at convincing the public. Our caucus has received a number of letters from communities concerned about this reorganization.

Bill 114 is going to be involved in here with regard to the environment. I wonder if the minister is going to be able to tell us, with the consolidation of the form of the central and southwestern regions—now he is starting to get it, what I am talking about in the southwestern regions—will the numerous small municipalities such as Hanover, which has a population of only a few thousand, be able to compete directly with Metropolitan Toronto for recreation financing despite the fact it cannot offer his party the same number of votes?

1630

This Bill 114 is another example of this government wanting to collect extra revenues and put them into a pie whereby it can dish them out as it sees fit, just before an election. They are closing the parks down in the St Lawrence Parks Commission. Some four or five parks have been closed. There is a debt of some \$10 million run by that parks commission, which is now headed up by a very prominent Liberal in the area. As a matter of fact, the debt has increased by about 20% since he took control of it. The manager there now is the Deputy Minister of Health, I believe. The parks in this province are something like the same as the roads: they

have been going downhill ever since this government came to power.

I want to close by saying that Bill 114 is—

Mr D. S. Cooke: What do you think about hunting in the parks?

Mr Ferraro: It depends what you are hunting.

Mr McLean: Well, I am getting a few vibes from across the way here with regard to the parks in Ontario. But I have to tell you, Mr Speaker, that Algonquin Park is one of the nicest parks of the province. I happen to have the availability to go moose hunting there every year, just out of the park in a nice camp which is operated by a very good group of fellow conservationists and sportsmen. The Ministry of Natural Resources has increased the camping fee substantially, a further tax grab from the province.

With regard to the environment being used as a lottery, I in no way accept it. I would hope that the minister would look at the amendment that we have. You cannot continue to put such important items as the environment and health care into a lottery. If there was a special lottery for health care, I am sure many seniors and many people would go out and buy a ticket for health care. They would. The environment is the same. Why not have a special lottery for the environment whereby people, if they show that interest, could go and buy a lottery ticket for the environment? The government's concern with regard to the lottery is all part of a pie. I do not agree with it and I will not be supporting the government bill.

Mr Reycraft: The member for Simcoe East, as did the member for Beaches-Woodbine, made reference to Bill 119 and the committee hearings on that bill. There seems to be some argument about what was said to that committee during those public hearings. As a member of the committee, I remember very well that the common theme by those making presentations to the committee was that there should be a guarantee, a firm commitment of lottery funds that could be used for culture and recreation, sports and fitness in any given year.

The Treasurer appeared before the committee and gave the members of the Legislature that commitment late in the hearings. He committed \$120 million per year for a total of three years for culture and recreation, sports and fitness. That is a total commitment of \$360 million. It is a far larger commitment than was ever made from lottery profits for sports and culture at any previous time.

Mr D. S. Cooke: I would just like to comment indirectly on the comments of the member for Simcoe East, but directly on the comments of the member for Middlesex. I think the member makes an appropriate comment that if there were absolute guarantees, if this government had a history of keeping its guarantees and its promises, then we would not have to have these types of debates. But we remember what the Premier said a few days before the last election, that he had a plan to lower insurance rates. He had absolutely no plan at all. The history of this government is that it will say anything it thinks people want to hear in order to get their votes and then when the reality comes of delivering on those commitments, it says to heck with what it has promised; it does not matter because people will not remember.

If the government is serious about guaranteeing a certain amount of money for culture and recreation, which was the original purpose of lotteries in this province, then it should build it directly into the legislation. If the environment and health care are essential services in this province, which we certainly believe they are, then we should not be relying on lotteries anyway. They should come out of the basic, fair taxation policy that we should have in this province.

These kinds of gimmicks and these kinds of promises that the Liberals never intend to implement and just make to get votes do not wash with the opposition because we have been burned too often by the Liberals, and so have the people of this province.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): Continuing with comments and questions—can we do that? Let me think about this. I do not think we can.

Mr Pouliot: You can indeed, and thank you kindly, Mr Speaker. Of course, with respect, you are the authority here.

My distinguished colleague has said it—the pass line, 7-11, a game of chance to address what the Ontarians are saying collectively, that the environment in which we live is far too important to be left to a game of chance resembling a seance. Tales of Houdini: sometimes you may see the money and other times you may not; a sense of déjà vu where the minister comes in like a phantom, like a ghost dragging his chains. It has been done before.

Mr Speaker, you have heard of scavengers of the political marketplace. You have read about the day when vultures would be gathering, where the only component, the only element, the only focus that counted was the favour of the taxpayers. One more time let it be heard that the taxpayers of Ontario view the environment as a sacred trust and have given this government a significant mandate with 94 seats at present and say: "You have a budget of \$46 billion. You do what the population requires to make sure that our place under the sun and our river will remain pristine for as long as the sun shines and the river flows, that our children and generations to come can look to the future not only with confidence but be able to savour what is best about Ontario."

I am very sad to report that the confidence of this government is eroding rather quickly.

Interjection.

Mr Pouliot: You have missed the boat.

The Acting Speaker: I was just inquiring about rotation. That is why I was questioning the member for Lake Nipigon standing in his place.

Mr Neumann: I was interested in listening to the speech of the member for Simcoe East on this important bill. I was interested in the results of the survey he did where he indicated that a majority of residents in his area support the idea of using lottery funds for the environment.

I had a group of citizens, kind of an outreach group within their church, come into my constituency office—and it is great to see citizens respond on this whole issue of the environment—to go over a number of proposals they had. They had centred on the environment as an issue they wanted to deal with. They put a number of proposals to me—this was several months ago—and one of their suggestions was why does the government not develop a lottery to raise funds for the use of the environment.

I pointed out this was something that was announced within the budget and I mentioned that some of the opposition members were opposed to it and that guffaws had come from the suggestion. I remember when it was announced guffaws had come from the official opposition. They just could not believe that kind of response on an issue like the environment. They thought this was a great idea. They had not happened to hear about it, but they were commending the government for coming up with this initiative.

1640

I believe this initiative will have support across Ontario, that if we can raise money for the environment to clean up our rivers and waterways and for special projects for the environment, this is going to complement—this is obviously not the only initiative of

the government on the environment—initiatives such as the one announced by the Minister of Government Services yesterday, where the government is using its purchasing policy to be in keeping with developing sustainable development and programs that will show leadership in the province in cleaning up the environment.

Mr McLean: I am very pleased with the speakers, with the issues that they have raised. It is very interesting with regard to the Treasurer coming to make this very great commitment that they speak of.

Is this the same government, tell me, that said free trade would be vetoed, that there would be no deal unless certain conditions were met? Is this the same government that came to Orillia and said there would be \$30 million for a hospital expansion? What happened with that promise? Is this the same government that said there would be 4,400 new beds created in the province, which there have not been? Is this the same government that wanted to have that tire tax on the people of this province? What has happened with the tire tax? Is this the same government that is talking here today?

I cannot believe it and I say shame on those members for indicating that this lottery is going into a lottery fund for the environment. That is not so. It is going into the Ontario Lottery Corporation in the general pie that will be divided up as they see fit. There is no special lottery here for the environment at all.

That is what there should be: a separate lottery where you could buy a ticket for the environment. That is not the case.

It is the same with health care in this province; there should be a special lottery for health care. If people want to go out and buy a lottery ticket for health care, they can do it.

It is misleading people if members say this is a bill that is going to have the environment looked after. It is not so. They will pass out the amount of money they see fit, where they see fit, and it is going to be less than \$20 million that is going to go for the environment.

They should be putting their efforts into recycling and reusing. In the questionnaire I did, a high percentage of the people wanted that. The questionnaire indicated that people want a separate lottery. They do not want it all part of a pie to be given out as the government sees fit. That is not a commitment to the environment at all. That is a commitment to try to get re-elected and that is not what this government should be doing.

I say shame on the minister; better luck the next time.

Mr Kerrio: I certainly rise to support Bill 114 and I would like to commend the minister on putting forward a very important bill.

I think the very first thing that comes to mind is the fact that the two opposition parties, day after day, belabour this government with this supposed interest in health and in the environment, and the minute we put in a bill that addresses these two very important priorities that the people of Ontario have—the people of Ontario have spoken out that these two priorities are uppermost in their responsibility and this government is responding to that purpose. I feel very good about this bill.

I have another interest in the bill. It is a more personal interest.

Mrs Cunningham: This bill does not address health care and the environment. This is a lottery bill. What does it have to do with health care?

Mr Kerrio: Our friend who just ran for the leadership of the sinking ship, if she wants to talk to this issue, her turn is going to come up, I would say. Would you not be willing to give her a chance to speak to this bill, Mr Speaker?

Mrs Cunningham: I will speak next. You go on now, but you will have to say for my speech, though.

Mr Kerrio: That is unfair punishment. I do not think I could agree to that.

I would like to go back a few years in time to 1975 when Wintario was the brainchild of the former government. I decided that if I was going to be on the team of the Liberal Party, I would not aspire to be critic of one of those high-profile ministries but rather start at the bottom and work my way up. So I started out as critic of the Minister of Culture and Recreation of that day. The minister was Mr Welch, my neighbour.

Having said that, Mr Welch was gung-ho for this particular bill. But there was one thing that entered my mind as the critic and I brought it to the attention of the then Premier of the province, Mr Davis, and the minister that we were in fact looking with some kind of an eye at the income that was being generated by the Irish sweepstakes. I remind all the members here that all of the money that was generated worldwide by the Irish sweepstakes was to support their hospitals.

I said to the Premier of the day, “Mr Premier, do you realize that if you have now decided you would like to get in on some of that money, you are going to upset the people who raise funds for other very worthwhile purposes—muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, Heart and Stroke Foundation, cancer people—who were out running their own lotteries to raise money for a very worthy cause and were now going to have a government step in and use their funding for purposes other than what they were displacing?” I found that not quite acceptable.

In fact, I thought it was worth while to put in a private member's bill. In response to a private member's bill that I put, my local newspaper printed the following editorial:

“Vince Kerrio, Niagara Falls MPP, has come up with a good, sound idea. But unfortunately, because the Liberals are languishing in third spot in the provincial Legislature, this brainwave probably will be consigned to gather dust on some dark shelf at Queen's Park.”

Not so.

Miss Martel: It would now, that's for sure.

Mrs Cunningham: One good, sound idea.

Mr Kerrio: Not so, I have to tell that member who interjected. This is coming to fruition in the last couple of years with Bill 119 and now Bill 114.

Interjections.

Mr Kerrio: I would like to carry on without interruption, if I may. Members will have plenty of time to interject later on, and I will listen to what they have to say and respond accordingly.

“Mr Kerrio, his eyes on the money generated by Wintario, does not want to see the cash frittered away. Instead he would present a private member's bill...which would require...funds from Wintario to be channeled into hospitals in the province.

“This scheme would allow better health care, help prevent an increase in OHIP premiums and probably allow the most modern equipment to be provided in hospitals where some things are lacking. It could take the pressure off the backs of hard-pressed hospital boards who are beginning to wonder how they can keep going.

“Mr Kerrio, a newcomer to provincial politics, will learn quickly that private member's bills, however sound and solid, get shuffled around until they are lost in limbo. And that is a great pity because there is merit in this...plan.

“Even in what probably will be a failure Mr Kerrio deserves a slap on the back for trying darned hard to do his job” as he sees fit for his constituents.

So you see, Mr Speaker, while there are those who talk at great length about their interest in the environment and in health care, when it comes right down to the hard, cold facts of making

decisions that a government has to make—the opposition party does not have to make those decisions. They do not have to try to decide where the money should be expended; our Treasurer does. He has given a guarantee in fact that a good part of the money is always going to be guaranteed for culture and fitness and some of the buildings that we put up for these very important activities in our communities.

But I must say that in this day and age when we get all of the criticism from the opposition parties, I am very, very surprised that they do not encourage and in fact come over on this side and support a bill that is going to give money to the environment and to the hospitals, surplus funds, surplus money, that we have generated, good money.

1650

There have been a few comments about the fact that people are buying tickets for a particular cause. I do not find that is the case. I think that in fact when they bought Irish sweepstakes tickets they were buying them to see if they could win the sweepstakes. I think that when people buy lottery tickets a good percentage of them buy them with the hope that they are going to win the lottery. I do not think they feel that they have to dedicate the purchase to a particular cause.

I think this government is taking a very firm stand that money that is raised in the lottery, while it is guaranteed that it will continue to go to support sports and fitness, the surplus funds are going to a very good cause that the opposition members seem to support until it comes time to support the bill. So I am very pleased in fact that subsequent to Wintario, when the then minister introduced a new provincial lottery, he said to the member for Niagara Falls, "I must give you some credit that now this new lottery has some money dedicated to health-related issues."

So you see, Mr Speaker, I think that good-thinking people will support a bill that says, "Yes, we're going to support culture and fitness and those good things," but when we raise the kind of funds that are raised, it seems most appropriate that in a day and age when everyone wants some comfort, we are going to be able to support our hospitals and our environment. This bill is doing just that. I am pleased to support it and I hope the members on the other side might change their minds and do the very same thing.

Mr Pouliot: I would like to commend the former Minister of Natural Resources and Energy. The point that he made about introducing a private member's bill is indeed well taken. He, better than anyone, should be aware that we too, as the official opposition, are going that route.

Now that we have his acquiescence, his guarantee, that our private member's bill, in lieu of a chance to dream for people who buy a lottery ticket, in view of a hypocritical—because it has to be said—way, method, scheme of taxation—of course, we do sense that there is a saturation at the marketplace, that the accomplice to the Minister of Revenue can no longer impose a Remo tax, and if people do not pay their Remo tax, then they get repo. It is from one scheme to the other. The Minister of Revenue, to the tune of \$46 billion, has been exaggerating.

We have reached a stage where the proverbial straw makes it impossible for us to give more. We have given everything. So the government, in its wisdom, or the lack of wisdom, comes up with a scheme, a lure, and says, "Because of temptation, because the populace has to be given a chance to dream, what we will do is take part of the profits that we make and turn it into a game of chance, channel that money into a game of chance." I am sure that in intent, in spirit, what the former minister had in mind when some 15 years ago he introduced his private member's bill has not been adhered to by the government. He has won his game

of chance, but the people of Ontario are still looking forward to sound measures regarding their environment.

Hon Mr Black: I want to compliment the member for Niagara Falls on his comments here in the House today. In 1976 his ideas made a great deal of sense; 14 years later they continue to make a great deal of sense. It is worth noting, Mr Speaker, and I know that you will agree with this because you are a member who listens carefully to what is being said in this House, that the member for Niagara Falls made more sense in the last 10 minutes than all the members of the opposition have made all afternoon. I compliment him on a knowledge and understanding of the issues and of this particular piece of legislation.

Mr Farnan: I want to correct the interpretation of the member for Niagara Falls. The member for Niagara Falls used as an example the Irish hospitals sweepstake as an example which inspired him in terms of his particular private member's bill. I am not sure what the private member's bill said and that is why I asked him, during his comments, if he would specify what the private member's bill said. The private member's bill may have said that the funds be used for hospitals. Now, the Irish hospitals sweepstake, when you bought that ticket, you knew you were buying a ticket to provide funds for hospitals.

The reality of the matter is that when this government and previous governments had the Wintario ticket, they had pictures of orchestras, they had pictures of parks, they had pictures signifying culture, sports, recreation, fitness. When people purchased a ticket, they presumed that ticket was going to provide the funds for those specific areas—all of the funds, not some of the funds.

What has happened is that the people of Ontario now realize that there is a slush fund. Some of the funds went to all of these particular designated areas, but there was a slush fund that the Liberal government used to feather its own nest. What they are doing with hospitals and the environment is, they are simply saying, "Here is another way to market lottery tickets to encourage people to spend more money on lotteries," but there is no guarantee that the funds will find their way to the designated areas, none at all.

Mr Kerrio: I certainly appreciate the comments by the minister and I would like to thank him for those comments. I certainly can take exception to comments made by my good friend the member for Lake Nipigon, but I must comment about the other question regarding my comments about the sweepstakes and the hospital.

I am convinced that when people buy lottery tickets, they do not, in a sense, feel that they are dedicating those funds to a particular cause. I think they buy a lottery ticket to take a chance on winning the lottery. There are those few who might feel the other way. I have respect for those kinds of people and I think the proportions would be such that the people who buy for a particular cause will find that it is funded, as the Treasurer has said, over \$120 million.

Not to take away from the circumstance, my concern at the time I raised the issue about putting the Irish sweepstakes out of business in this country was that we were then going to enter into that business and we were going to impact on some very worthy causes that were using lottery income as their funding, as were muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis and the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario. I asked the Premier of the day if he would not consider that he was moving into an area where he was really pushing those people out of business and making it more difficult for them to fund those worthwhile causes.

So, yes, in my private member's bill I was looking at putting the bulk of the money into hospitals to replace the moneys that were taken from the sweepstakes of that day. Notwithstanding

that, I find the next best thing that we can do now is to address Bill 114 and Bill 119 and address those two issues.

But we should remember one thing: The government, wherever the funds are, is responsible to the electorate for the spending. I think that is the bottom line and, on that basis, I thank the good members for their comments.

Mr Laughren: I was not going to take part in the debate this afternoon, but I have been provoked by other members.

The last five years have been a history of mismanagement of lotteries in this province. I say that because of one simple reason: the number of bills that have been before this assembly dealing with lotteries. They started out in 1986, I guess it was, with Bill 38. Bill 38 was going to take the money from lotteries and just channel it directly into the consolidated revenue fund. That is what Bill 38 was designed to do.

There was such an uproar across the province, primarily by the municipalities, and because it was a minority government and the two opposition parties said to the government, "You must not do this," that the government backed down. The Treasurer backed down and simply did not proceed with Bill 38. You can argue whether or not he withdrew it or whether or not he did not proceed; the fact is he did not proceed with Bill 38, so it died before the 1987 election.

1700

Then there was, of course, another bill that was even more shameful than that. It was called Bill 115. I do not expect all members to remember the numbers of the bills, but Bill 115 was a bill designed to require anyone who sells lottery tickets to do so with the approval of the Ontario government, and you could not sell tickets except for the face value of the ticket. You could not sell it for more than that.

The reason that was done is that there was a white collar thug in Ontario who was selling lottery tickets by mail, primarily to the United States, for over \$2 each.

Mr Pouliot: Name the minister.

Mr Laughren: We had public hearings on that particular bill. The minister of the day, the member for Victoria-Haliburton, was very much in support of his own bill, of course, and was quite concerned about it.

But do you know what? The government refused to call the bill after it had been through the committee stage of public hearings. The government refused to call it. When I went to the minister and said: "We have gone through the public hearings. A lot of people took a lot of personal abuse in public hearings as a result of that bill," the minister said: "You will have to go to the Premier. I cannot tell you why the bill is not being proceeded with."

To this day, to me that was one of the most shameful acts of this government. After bringing in a bill to stop this white collar thug from selling these tickets in the United States at more than twice the face value of the ticket, the Premier ordered that the bill not be proceeded with. Members are going to have to use their own imaginations and search their own consciences as to why that in effect happened. I do not know. I can only guess and I can only imagine, and I will not engage in that speculation here.

Then we had Bill 119. Bill 119 was the predecessor to this one, which said that: "It is not appropriate that all the funds go into sports, culture and recreation. We've got to channel some off into hospitals." Bill 119 said that whatever is not used in other ways is going to be used for hospitals.

Mr Neumann: You're against funding hospitals, I suppose.

Mr Laughren: As far as the idiots who claim that if you are against this bill, you are against hospitals, I do not think we even need to concern ourselves with their stupid remarks.

Interjection.

Mr Laughren: That is correct. That is exactly what I am saying, that those people who make the argument—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Kerrio: Can't you make comments without that language?

The Deputy Speaker: Will the member withdraw that remark, please?

Mr Laughren: Yes, I will withdraw, but I think it shows the intellectual depth of members of this assembly when they say that if you are opposed to this bill, you are opposed to hospitals. How stupid do they think the public is out there in Ontario? If you do not include education in this bill, does that mean that those people are opposed to education?

Mr Speaker, is that what you would interpret this bill to mean, that because you do not channel some of the funds into education as well as hospitals and the environment that you are all against education? How stupid do they think we are?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Ballinger: Don't be mad at me.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Durham-York, please. The member will recall that the standing orders request that the member address the Speaker.

Mr Laughren: I am trying to do that.

The point I am trying to make is that because members oppose this bill, it has absolutely nothing to do with whether they are in support of an appropriate health care system in Ontario.

How in the world could anybody argue differently? And yet we get members of the Liberal Party, the same party that is short-changing the health care system in this province, the same party that is doing diddly-squat in the delivery of home care in Ontario—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for Durham-York, please. If members want to react to a member's speech, they have the two-minute period afterwards, not during the member's speech. Please. Standing orders.

Mr Neumann: It's hard not to react to some of what is said.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Brantford, please.

Mr Lupusella: He is provoking.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Dovercourt.

Mr Laughren: If they keep interjecting, Mr Speaker, I would throw the bums out if I were you.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt is making sure the Speaker's circulation is well activated this afternoon. Will the member withdraw that term, please?

Mr Laughren: Yes. I am sorry, Mr Speaker.

Mr Matrundola: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I take exception to the way business is conducted in this House. This is an honourable House where business should be conducted in a businesslike manner with due respect for everyone.

I strongly object when a member of his own volition or intentionally uses words and then retracts them. Mr Speaker, you well understand that if a person kills another person, afterwards he cannot retract that; he cannot bring the person back to life. Therefore, it is impossible to keep using improper language in this House and then retracting it. I suggest that perhaps some measures should be taken to address that.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am just asking all members of the House without exception to please respect the standing orders, and I would make a special request to the member for Nickel Belt not to use unparliamentary language.

Mr Pouliot: On the same point of order, Mr Speaker: With respect, I am appalled and shocked that on one of the rare times—my distinguished colleague has been in this House serving the people of Nickel Belt loyally and faithfully for a period of 20 years, and no lesson of decorum or good manners from a recent arrival, the member for Willowdale—

Mr Kerrio: Recent arrival. What's that supposed to mean?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for Niagara Falls, please.

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Lake Nipigon, please. Standing orders apply to all members no matter how long they have been here and decorum applies at all times.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for Durham-York. The member for Lake Nipigon.

Mr Laughren: Not only will I try not to be provocative, but I will ignore the fatuous comments of the member for Willowdale.

I am sure you understand, though, Mr Speaker, it is very hard to accept comments from the government about our lack of commitment to health care when it is this same government that allows our elderly and sick to be hosed down in closets in this province—

The Deputy Speaker: Please address your remarks to Bill 114.

Mr Laughren: I am—because of inadequate funding of our health care system, and at the same time to be told that because this is a bill that will divert funds from the lottery profits to the environment that somehow we have a lack of commitment to the environment.

This is the very same government that brought in an environmental tax on tires and then watched the tires burn at Hagersville. So we need no lectures whatsoever from this government on our commitment to education, to health care, to the environment. We need no lectures from these people whatsoever. They are the ones who have made the promises and broken the promises every day since they formed the government back in 1985. We do not need any lectures from them.

1710

This bill, as members know, is designed to drain off funds from the lottery profits, away from both hospitals and from culture and recreation into the environmental causes. If I were to make an argument, which I would not do, of course, I could say, "Here they are, this same government diverting funds from health care into the environment."

What kind of competition are we setting up here? The Ontario Lottery Corporation Act already allows funds to go into hospitals in Ontario. Now the government is saying, "Not only do we want the money to go into hospitals and culture and recreation, but we want it to go into environmental protection as well." So whatever it puts into the environment is going to be taken away from hospitals. Where is the money coming from for the environment?

I do not see any new moneys. All I see is that the bill is changing the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. Let the minister rise in his place and correct me if I am wrong. Instead of allowing funds to go from lottery profits to help the hospitals and into culture, recreation and sports, this bill is now allowing money also to go into environmental protection and enhancement. I believe that is correct and I think that is the correct interpretation

of this bill. If that is the case, then surely it is draining money away from hospitals, from culture and recreation and from sports. But where is the extra money coming from?

Are you going to put any money into the environment through this bill, or are you not? If you are going to put money into the environment as a result of this bill, where is it coming from? I can tell you where it is coming from. It is coming from the hospitals. We are going to have more people hosed down in closets when this bill goes through. How do you like that? That is another interpretation of this bill.

Mr Ballinger: We are starting a new game.

Mr Laughren: You people want to get into the game of saying, "Who protects the health care system in the province of Ontario?" We can get into that game.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Address the Speaker.

Mr Laughren: You tell me how you justify any kind of defence of your health care system in this province, given your record in northern Ontario, given the record of protection of native people all across the province—

The Deputy Speaker: Address the Speaker, please.

Mr Laughren:—given the way you are allowing elderly and sick to be hosed down in closets. Do not give me a lecture about protecting—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for Nickel Belt has not understood the standing orders when I say "Address the Speaker."

Mr Laughren: I am.

Mr Pouliot: Through you, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: No, the member has to address the Speaker, according to the standing orders, please. Address the Speaker.

Mr Laughren: I am addressing the Speaker, but so help me, I have searched the standing orders and I do not see any place in them that says when I address you, I have to look at you. I am addressing the Speaker when I make my comments.

What we are really talking about is that question that started away back in 1975 when the original lottery bill came in: Should there be a special allocation of lottery profits? That is the question we are dealing with. The agreement of all parties was that lottery profits were not like taxes. There is that difference and I think all members in this House agreed—

Mr Kerrio: It wasn't real money.

Mr Laughren: I do not know what the member for Niagara Falls is blabbing about now.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls, please.

Mr Kerrio: They ranted at me when I was up, never gave me a space. Come on now. Let's say it the way it is. I bought it. I bought it from all you people.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Kerrio: I ate it. You people won't.

Mr Laughren: He is out of control. Throw the bum out.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Will the member for Nickel Belt please withdraw that comment? Thank you. Order. The standing orders provide a two-minute period for comments, including for the member for Niagara Falls. Could we resume with the member for Nickel Belt please?

Mr Laughren: I really am trying not to be provocative any more for the rest of my comments, but I do not know why the government feels so sensitive about the issue of health care unless there is some guilt attached to its record.

Mr Ballinger: It is all the innuendos you throw.

Mr Laughren: Perhaps they are embarrassed about the elderly and the sick being hosed down in clothes closets in our institutions in this province.

Mr Ballinger: You are an exploiter. Members are exploited.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Durham-York, please.

Mr Laughren: It is a fact that we do not need lectures on health care in this province.

I was trying to deal with the question of whether or not lottery profits are indeed just another form of tax. I believe most members of the assembly see a difference between ordinary tax revenues and lottery profits. Otherwise, why do we have designation of lottery profits? What other revenues to government are designated for specific purposes? I do not know of any. If members know of any others, I sure would like to know what they are. The fact is that this assembly regards lottery profits as different than ordinary tax revenues in the province.

I think the reason we collectively feel that way and have ever since 1975 is that lotteries are a game of chance. They are an extremely volatile source of revenue. With all the individual lottery games, any one game does not last a long time and they have to keep changing them and so forth. I think most people felt right from the beginning that essential services in Ontario should not depend upon lottery profits. There seemed to be a consensus from the beginning that this was the case and that lottery profits should go towards such things as sports, culture and recreation, where there is a discretionary aspect to the allocation of the amount of funds.

When it comes to health care, education and, I would argue, the environment as well, it is not the same. Those are absolutely essential services which we must provide. That is not something that should be dependent on games of chance. It should not be a form of voluntary tax that protects the environment, provides health services to our citizens or, for that matter, educates the citizens of Ontario. It should not be a voluntary tax. Those essential services should be funded by the tax system of this province, not through games of chance.

If the sense in this assembly has changed, particularly among the members of the government who have the majority, and they feel lottery profits are simply another form of tax revenue, let them get off their hind legs and say so and do away with the designation entirely. We have lottery profits going into sports, culture, recreation, health care and now the environment. What do they have against education? Why not that? Do they not care about the education of our citizens? If so, why are they not putting funds from the lotteries into education? I have not heard an explanation for that. Perhaps we will hear it later on in the debate. Perhaps when the minister winds up in the next day or two, he will tell us what he has against education in Ontario. I would like to know that.

Mr Pouliot: What about roads?

Mr Laughren: Yes, what about highways? If we did a poll across northern Ontario, they might say: "What is this about the environment? We're not getting any environment protection in northern Ontario. Why don't you put the money into northern Ontario roads, for heaven's sake?" The government cannot have it both ways. What is the next thing they are going to divert lottery profits into? Government services? I do not know. I would like to know, though, what they are going to do next with Ontario lottery profits.

What the government is doing is chipping away at the whole principle of designation. They are chipping away at the designation of lottery profits. They do not have the courage to say, "We now believe that lottery profits are simply another form

of tax revenue." If they believe that, why do they not say so? Oh no, they chip away bit by bit at the lottery profits and keep diverting them into something else.

I remember very well the debate on the previous bill. We are not debating the previous bill so I will not get into that. I hope the minister, perhaps even today, will tell us philosophically what he feels about lottery profits, where they should be designated and why, and where it is not appropriate to put lottery profits.

Is there any part of the operation of this province where lottery profits do not belong? What is going to be next? Is he going to decide that, "Well, I think that there are a lot of applications by the various churches out there for renovations to their churches, for access and so forth and that all lottery should be diverted to churches as well as health care and the environment"? How about that? How about all capital grants to churches for access for the disabled to come from lottery profits? Would the minister agree to that? I would like to know. And if not, why not?

1720

Mr Farnan: Affordable housing.

Mr Laughren: Affordable housing. What is wrong with that? What has he got against housing?

Mr Ballinger: You wouldn't vote for that anyway.

Mr Laughren: I would vote for a bill if the Liberals were honest about it. This is a dishonest bill. That is what it is. It is a completely dishonest bill.

Mr Pouliot: It is a crown-and-anchor minister we have. That is what it is, the chief crown-and-anchor minister.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Laughren: That too.

Mr Pouliot: It's a bingo, a tombola.

The Deputy Speaker: Order please, the member for Durham-York and the member for Lake Nipigon, both of you.

Mr Laughren: I appreciate the protection you are providing me this afternoon, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The same I provide to all members.

Mr Laughren: Oh, yes. I was not suggesting you were singling me out, Mr Speaker, for a special purpose.

A while ago—as a matter of fact, on 10 April 1990—I introduced a bill in this assembly which I plagiarized from somebody else.

Mr Ballinger: Talk about deceit.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Durham-York, please.

Mr Laughren: I confess. An Act to establish the Ontario Lottery Profits Awards Council would have created the Ontario Lottery Profits Awards Council to deal with the profits of provincial lotteries and to promote cultural, multicultural and recreational activities. What that would do, if the government would proceed with it—and since the member was bragging about how he found the only editorial written in history—no, I will not say that.

Mr Kerrio: Go ahead. I can take anything you guys hand out. You can't though; you're stuck with it the other way.

The Deputy Speaker: Order please, the member for Niagara Falls.

Mr Laughren: The former minister found—it must have taken a lot of research—an editorial praising him for something he had done.

Mr Ballinger: That's not fair.

Mr Kerrio: I accept cheap shots.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Laughren: I can recall the former minister's stewardship of our forests, so I do have a lingering resentment about that stewardship, Mr Speaker.

Mr Kerrio: Who planted 93 million trees up to that year?

Mr Laughren: And did not give a damn whether they grew or not, did not care whether they grew or not. That is the same minister.

Mr Pouliot: It was a letter to the editor written by his mom, not an editorial.

Mr Adams: Would the member for Lake Nipigon go back to his seat?

Mr Laughren: Oh, we have got another speaker on the other side now trying to rule.

The Deputy Speaker: It is very cyclical this afternoon. I personally long for all members to respect the standing orders on a permanent basis.

An hon member: Hear that, Floyd.

Mr Laughren: Tell that to the member for Peterborough.

The Deputy Speaker: All members without exception. The member for Nickel Belt, please, will resume.

Mr Laughren: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think you would have to agree that I am not being provocative in this part of my speech.

The reason I introduced a bill establishing the Ontario Lottery Profits Awards Council was to take away the feeling out there in Ontario that the lottery profits are a huge political slush fund for whatever the government of the day happens to be. There is that very strong sense out there that is the role that the lottery profits play. The lottery profits awards council would have removed that sense because it would have been an independent council selected by the various organizations that receive funding now, multicultural, sports and recreation and cultural organizations.

But, of course, I do not expect the government to reject the enticement of almost \$500 million worth of lottery profits every year. Nevertheless, the reason I introduced the bill was that it would have given a very strong sense of independence of the lottery profits from the political party in power, and I think that would have been a very positive change.

So at first blush, when you look at Bill 114—and blush they should—the bill states that it is simply to allow money to be spent on the environment. I can see why members would say, "Well, if you don't like this bill, then you must not like the environment," just as on its predecessor, Bill 119, they said, "Well, if you don't like this bill, you must not like hospitals." That is why I got angry at the beginning of my remarks, because it is the kind of comment—

Mr Kerrio: You can't handle it.

Mr Laughren: It is not I who cannot handle it. It is the fact of what that says about the members' attitude towards the public. That they would believe that kind of line speaks volumes about the attitude of this government towards the people of Ontario. They think that just because they break promises with impunity they can make outrageous statements with impunity and people out there are so stupid they will believe it. The public in the province of Ontario knows a stupid argument when it hears one. When members opposite keep making them, they will always recognize them. Make no mistake about that. The people in Ontario are a lot smarter than a lot of members in this assembly give them credit for being.

Mr Ballinger: Just on your side.

Mr Laughren: I am not saying any side at all. I am saying that if I were to stand up here and try to make the argument in a serious way, the way other members are doing from the government side, that because the government was not putting some of this lottery money into education it did not care about the education of our children, that would be a stupid argument and would indicate how stupid I thought the people were who would buy that. Yet that is the very argument the people in the Liberal Party, the Liberal caucus, were making to me because I oppose this bill, that I do not care about the environment, that I do not care about hospitals. What a ridiculous attitude.

Mr Kerrio: Right.

Mr Laughren: The member for Niagara Falls still thinks that.

Mr Kerrio: Yes, that your arguments are ridiculous.

Mr Laughren: It is absolutely ridiculous that we have to put up with this kind of silliness from members on the government side.

I could see that if we had a health care system that did not abuse the old and sick in our society, then maybe the government members could make an argument, but any government that should hide its shame in the way it treats our elderly in this society, the way it treats our native people, the way it treats northerners and discriminate against them, I want to tell members that this government has no right to criticize any member or anybody else for their views about health care in Ontario, because it is absolutely shameful.

Mr Kerrio: Stick to the bill.

The Deputy Speaker: Order please, the member for Durham York.

Mr Ballinger: Well, he is outrageous, Mr Speaker.

Mr Pouliot: He is right on.

The Deputy Speaker: If members wish to respond, they can use the two-minute period afterwards.

Mr Ballinger: I can't wait. I apologize.

The Deputy Speaker: Members will wait. That goes for all members. If they wish to respond, they can use the two-minute response period, not during the member's speech.

Mr Laughren: There is no reward in this place for not being provocative. Members still heckle when you try to be most reasonable.

The reason I am opposed to this bill, Bill 114, is because what it does is it breaks a commitment made to the people of Ontario, when the lottery system was set up, which said that the funds would be channelled into culture, recreation and sports. I do not know why or how the government selected the environment as being the next one on the list. They selected hospitals first. No, actually they selected the consolidated revenue fund first. Then they selected hospitals. Now they have selected the environment. Can education be far behind? I can see that the government really has no commitment to the designation of lottery profits at all.

What government members really have to ask themselves is how do they view lottery profits. If they are just another form of tax revenue, then they should stand up and say so and we can get on with debating in the various ministries how the consolidated revenue fund should be spent. That would be an honest approach. But what the government has done here is completely dishonest. It is pretending it is designating profits from the lottery, but it is not. It is not at all. That is why I find this bill so offensive.

1730

I feel as strongly about my opposition to this bill as I did to its predecessor which channelled funds out of the funding to hospitals. Before, we had the culture, recreation and sports organizations competing with hospitals. Now we have got

sports, culture and recreation competing with hospitals and environmental protection and we have got hospitals now competing with the environment for priorities of hospital lottery funds. I do not know what kind of game they are playing here. Who is going to win?

I suppose if one objects to money going to any organization now, one will be told: "What are you? Are you against hospitals? Are you against environmental protection? Are you against culture, recreation and sports?" It is ridiculous. This government has made a mockery of the whole question of designation of lottery funds. It has made a joke out of it. Be honest. Stand up and say: "We no longer believe in the designation of lottery profits. We believe they are just another form of tax revenue." Say that. Have the courage and the honesty to say that. But it will not. Oh no, it will not, Mr Speaker. Believe me, I know it will not, because for some reason it seems to think that it can take away funds from lotteries and, one by one, pick off ministries into which it is going to channel the funds.

Mr Ballinger: Not true.

Mr Laughren: It is true. We started with sports, culture and recreation, then we moved to hospitals, now the environment. What is next? I think that the people of Ontario do not like the idea of the environment being protected on the basis of games of chance, of hospitals being funded on the basis of games of chance. I do not think that people believe that is the appropriate way to fund our hospitals and to fund the protection of the environment. I simply do not believe it. Those are essential services that should be funded through the legitimate tax system, not based on the people who buy the lottery tickets. What this government is really saying with this bill is that the people who buy lottery tickets are going to pay more for the protection of the environment than people who do not buy lottery tickets. That is what it is saying; there is no other way of putting it.

Mr Kerrio: Put it another way.

Mr Laughren: Well, there is no other honest way of putting it. The people who buy lottery tickets will be paying more for the protection of the environment when this bill is passed than the people who do not buy lottery tickets. I would be interested to hear the minister's response on that. If that is appropriate, then why do we not just set up a huge tin cup at the corner of Yonge and Queen and we can have everybody throw money in to protect the environment. That is the kind of system they are doing.

Mr Kerrio: You wouldn't put any in.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr Laughren: I rest my case. The member for Niagara Falls is quite right, I would not put a nickel in it. That is not how we should fund the protection of the environment. The protection of the environment should be funded through the legitimate tax system, a more progressive tax system—we could get into that if members like—than we have now. That is why I am adamantly opposed to this bill and why my colleague the member for Lake Nipigon is adamantly opposed to this bill too.

Hon Mr Black: Let him speak for himself.

Mr Laughren: Well, I think he is. I do not want to prolong the debate. I did not even intend to get involved in it this afternoon, but I felt I really had to in view of the fact that I really believe that the government is making a mistake when it says to the people of Ontario, "We want voluntary contributions for the protection of the environment." Because that is exactly what the government is doing, and those members who are good enough to go out there and buy lottery tickets are going to pay more for the protection of the environment than I am.

I personally do not buy lottery tickets. I do not believe in them. I do not buy them. Never. Therefore I am not paying my fair

share in the protection of the environment. That is my point. I would rather that we had a proper tax system to protect the environment, not dependent on whether or not I believe in buying lottery tickets, because that is what this bill says. And not just the environment. This bill, because it continues the existing system, says that those people out there who buy lottery tickets are going to help pay more for hospitals and more for the environment than people who do not buy lottery tickets.

I think that is fine if it is not an essential service, but I think essential services like hospitals and the protection of the environment—I think most of us agree that is absolutely essential. I do not see why my friend who buys lottery tickets by the bucket, any friend of mine who buys lottery tickets by the bucket, should have to pay more for the protection of the environment than I do. I am not paying my fair share and I am the first to admit that. I would hope that the minister would understand that that is not appropriate.

Hon Mr Black: I want to answer your question. Give me a chance.

Mr Laughren: I can see that the minister is anxious to respond to some of my comments, so I would just close by saying that I have enjoyed very much the debate this afternoon and the contribution that the hecklers have made to my debate.

Hon Mr Black: First of all, I want to acknowledge the contribution of the member for Nickel Belt to this House over many, many years. I want to tell him that I recognize that he is a fair and honest person and I recognize that he would not at any time do anything to mislead the public of Ontario.

I have a question I want to direct to him through you, Mr Speaker, if I may. I am looking right at you as I ask this question. I say to the member for Nickel Belt, through you, that I thought I heard him say that things like the environment and health care were essential services and, by inference, that protection of our culture and our heritage and recreation and physical fitness were not essential and therefore it would be all right to fund those with lottery funds. I know, Mr Speaker, that you will want to give the member for Nickel Belt an opportunity to respond, because I may have misunderstood him. If I did misunderstand him, I would like him to respond to my question.

I guess my question is this: Is that view accurate, first of all? Is it a personal view or is the policy of his party that fitness and culture and our heritage and recreation are non-essential services? That is my question, and I hope that the member for Nickel Belt will have an opportunity to respond to that, because I know he would want the record to be perfectly clear so that all of us can understand exactly what his position and the position of his party are on that issue.

Mr Farnan: Let me say that the member for Nickel Belt very clearly focused on lotteries as taxes. Not only are they taxes, they are a very unfair form of taxation. The reality of the matter is that poor people spend a larger percentage of their total income on lotteries than do middle-income or upper-income earners. It is true that middle-income and upper-income earners spend actually more money on lotteries than lower-income earners, but the fact of the matter is that lotteries are essentially a very regressive form of taxation.

This is a government that believes in taxes. The public record suggests that there are 32 different taxes. By regulation there are all kinds of tax increases that we never even see in this House. Liquor licences just recently went up 550%.

The reality of the matter is that the marketing strategists out of the minister's department are sitting down and they are brainstorming and saying: "How can we sell more lottery tickets? How can we get people to buy more lottery tickets when they are going out?" So as they go to buy their groceries, they basically

are to be lured by saying: "Hey, give your \$2 and you're going to be helping the environment. Give your \$2 and you're going to be helping hospitals." The reality of the matter is that this is simply a marketing strategy in order to dispossess people of additional funds. It is a sad day in Ontario when we look at the government that simply sees lotteries as a milch cow and that has not one centre for treatment of gamblers who are addicted in any way.

1740

Mr Ballinger: I just want to tell the member for Nickel Belt that I buy lottery tickets. I want to assure the member for Nickel Belt that if I ever win, I am going to offer him an all-expense trip to an antistress ranch in any part of Ontario he wants to be in.

Mr Speaker, I want to suggest to you that the member for Nickel Belt was not being provocative at all, he was being outrageous, absolutely outrageous. We are talking about a minor amendment to Bill 114. In the hour and a half that I have been here, I have heard the member for Nickel Belt stand up and touch on every issue you would ever dream of to fill in some time to bang the government.

As a government member, I get just a little bit tired of the opposition members exploiting the real issue. The real issue here is what this amendment to Bill 114 will do. It will allow the ministry to design a lottery that will allow people in Ontario who want to support the environment to go out and purchase a lottery ticket. It is an involuntary tax. The member does not have to buy it if he does not want to. We all know he is so cheap he would not buy it anyway.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Ballinger: The interesting thing is, there are many people in Ontario who care about the environment. When this was announced by the Treasurer, he thought this was a heck of a good idea for the people of Ontario.

Just because the member for Nickel Belt does not like it, is that any reason why this government should withdraw it? No, absolutely not. Anything that he supports is reason enough for me to say, "I'm going the other way, no question about it."

There is a lot of support all across Ontario for this amendment and I want to congratulate the minister for introducing it in this House, because those guys over there are all wet. They do not have a clue what they are talking about, as usual.

Mr Pouliot: I too buy lottery tickets. I cannot help but think what opportunity it would give me should I be a winner, and all the good I could do with the winnings. First, I would certainly advertise and make sure that all future lottery tickets designed to protect our beloved environment, to improve our environment, would be printed on recycled paper.

More important, of course, what the member for Nickel Belt has mentioned to us are the fundamentals that make a difference, whether we are talking about the ultimate gift of health and wellness, the very high profile, and rightly so, of the subject matter of our environment, the Ministry of Education and others, Culture and Tourism and Recreation. What we are saying is not only in terms of capital planning but in terms of those fundamentals that we must not exceed, surpass the perimeters, for those are too important, for those demand meticulous planning to reach a fruitful conclusion and should never be left to a game of chance.

That is not the way to go about things. This is not the way you become a manager and run a prosperous Ontario. That is not the way you run the books. This is not businesslike. This is not good accounting. This does not augur well for the future.

There is a methodology, there is a style, there is an approach. You have to be accountable. There is a way to do things, and a

game of chance, whether the tickets will sell well one day and not sell at all or sell less well the next day, is certainly no way to run an economy in a prosperous province such as Ontario. Surely there is a better way to do business.

Mr Laughren: I want to thank members for their comments. The question the minister asked is whether or not I saw culture and recreation as an essential service. Of course I do. As a matter of fact, I see culture and recreation as being a form of preventive health care and I argued that as strongly as I could during the debate on the previous bill, Bill 119.

What I object to is pitting preventive care, such as culture and recreation, against acute care, such as hospitals. That is what this government has done by saying to culture and recreation, "You've got to compete with the hospitals for this limited pool of funds." Now the government is doing it even worse. It is saying, "You've got to compete against hospitals and the environment for a limited pool of funds."

The reason the culture and recreation organizations were so concerned about it was that if they made an argument for more money, the other people would argue against them saying, "Don't you care about hospitals?" That was the very point I was trying to make, so I am pleased the minister seems to appreciate the fact, although he did have to ask me and I am a little concerned about that.

I would have thought the minister did not have to ask me about culture and recreation being essential services. I would have hoped that he, as the minister, would have recognized already that that is an essential service, and indeed it is a form of preventive health care, so I feel very strongly that those funds should be protected and designated for culture and recreation. I am somewhat taken aback that the minister does not understand that culture and recreation is an essential service and indeed is a form of preventive health care.

Anyway, I am pleased we have been able to straighten him out this afternoon and I would just encourage members, particularly of the government, to think seriously about what they are doing with this bill, because it is not the right move to make.

Mrs Cunningham: It is with some degree of interest that I find myself speaking to this Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act.

I find it interesting that we are adding a clause (c) to section 9 of the act. This clause, of course, could have been dealt with so that there would have been public hearings on behalf of the people of Ontario at the same time that we looked at amending the act with Bill 119. We added at that time a new way of dealing with moneys from the public, money that people put into the purchase of lottery tickets.

I think it is interesting to note that in September and October 1989 we looked at Bill 119 in a different way. Obviously, the government felt that at that time the Treasurer of Ontario and the Minister of Economics was responsible for changes or took the lead for changes to the lottery act, basically because he wanted some more control over how the money was designated.

First of all, what the government did in the fall of last year was to tell the public, who had purchased lottery tickets in support of physical fitness, sport, recreational and cultural activities and for the activities of the Ontario Trillium Foundation, that that money would of course first of all go into the consolidated revenue fund with all of the other money—that is what the amendment was saying—and that in fact the Lieutenant Governor in Council may direct money from the consolidated revenue fund for the promotion and development of physical fitness, sports, recreation and cultural activities and for activities of the Ontario Trillium Foundation, and if in fact the government chooses to put

money into those activities, anything that is left over shall then go into the support of the operation of hospitals.

We took a look at a very major change in intent of dollars that were spent on behalf of the public, those members of the public who chose to purchase lottery tickets. We looked at a very major change in intent at that point in time.

As a result, members of the public of Ontario who were involved in fitness and recreation, who were involved in cultural activities—libraries, art galleries, dance—who were involved in the activities of the Ontario Trillium Foundation, took it upon themselves, in the interest of democracy, to come and speak to the committee with regard to Bill 119.

At that time they came to speak to a principle, and that principle was the support they had received over the years from lottery dollars for the activities they mainly worked towards providing in their communities as volunteers. Many of them worked as volunteers, and many of the grant proposals that went to the government in support of recreation, fitness, cultural activities and activities of the Trillium Foundation were prepared not only with the executive directors of very small institutions across the province of Ontario, but certainly by volunteer organizations and non-profit groups.

So we looked at a very major change in direction, and one would ask oneself at this time, if we were looking at that time to put some of these dollars into hospitals in support of health care, why in the interest of efficiency did those groups not have the opportunity to talk about moneys diverted from these activities across the province—I am now talking about culture and recreation, sport—why at the same time did we not take a look at the government's to support, through lottery dollars, environmental concerns?

1750

There is no one in this Legislative Assembly who has spoken against, today or during the committee hearings, support for health care and support for the environment. I can only say that what was heard at those committee meetings was the great concern of members of the public. They took a look at the dollars people spent for their lottery tickets. They expect them to go to the services, the events, the arenas, the swimming pools, the art galleries, the libraries, the dance and the social service agencies that are in need of camping activities and recreational activities for young people.

There are so many non-profit groups and volunteer groups that look upon lottery donations, the funds that are received by the Ontario Lottery Corp, for support for these activities, most of which are supported by volunteers. So it was with some degree of dismay that many groups, almost 100% of the groups that appeared before the committee, saw that this government chose in fact to divert these lottery proceeds to health care.

At the same time I want to make it very clear that the perception of the public is that the dollars in fact will be spent on health care. I can say right now, in response to questions by committee members to the chairman of the committee—who is no longer in the House this afternoon, possibly because the time is so late—that this bill does not mean that any money would in fact be directed to the environment, certainly. It says “may direct” from general revenue funds, and so we are not certain, with the track record of this government, that money will in fact be directed to the environment. We are certainly not certain that any money would be diverted to health care. In fact, really both Bill 119, the previous amendment to the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, and now Bill 114 have totally confused the public as to where funds will go when in fact they are spending their dollars on lottery tickets.

There was an editorial that I think spoke well on behalf of the public of Ontario not too long ago when we were deliberating the changes in the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. I think it speaks well for these times as well. “For the past 13 years, like it or not, Queen’s Park has used lottery profits to fund sports, recreation and cultural activities and, coincidentally, buy some votes.” But now the government is about to change the rules of the game and we find ourselves here this afternoon speaking to another bill which in fact will change the rules of the game. Most of us who have been involved in volunteer activities to support sports, recreation and cultural activities over the years rather appreciated the fact that those people who clearly wanted to support those activities had another way of supporting them through the lottery funds.

That battle was not one that was won easily. It was with a great deal of public attention and public debate that the lottery fund was established in Ontario to begin with. So now we find ourselves confusing the public, even once more, around what will happen to the lottery fund tickets. Our great hope, certainly in our party, is that all of the money will be spent to fund sports, recreation and cultural activities, as was intended in the beginning. I should tell members that we have a lot of support for our position, along with the members of the official opposition.

This editorial goes on to state that “Treasurer Robert Nixon wants part of the pot to help fund the province’s hospitals.” This was Bill 119. I suppose if we were writing the same editorial today, we could say “and the environment.” This is partly because lottery profits have jumped from \$42 million in the first year of operation to almost \$500 million today.

No one would deny that money must be spent wisely and efficiently, but I still believe that, if you took a look at recreation and sport, took a look at cultural activities, environmental purposes and health purposes could be found within the mandates of those particular groups. When we talk about sports and recreation, we are talking about prevention of disease, both physical and mental. There are many, many grants and grant proposals that have been turned down but that could have been well-funded under the existing lottery corporation without the amendment to support hospitals. There are many, many grant applications—and we in fact heard from those groups during the deliberations—that could have been found to support environmental concerns.

As a matter of fact, the public has simply given up on this government when it comes to listening. During this debate, these same groups that got themselves organized to speak against Bill 119 for literally weeks and months—the coalition of sports, fitness, recreation and cultural groups which lobbied long and hard against Bill 119 and Bill 38—cannot, in my opinion, be expected to mobilize against or to oppose vigorously Bill 114. Do you know why, Mr Speaker? Because they have simply given up on the process here at Queen’s Park. They have simply given up on confidence and trust. Some 98% of the people who came before the committee that looked at Bill 119, and I would say the numbers would be exactly the same for Bill 114, have given up on the ability of this government to listen to their concerns.

If it had listened carefully, and if this government in fact wanted some of those dollars to support health care or the environment, it could have found those dollars within the mandate of the original act, the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. It could have supported health and it could have supported the environment. But this government in fact wants to send out the message that this is the government that in any way it can will support health care and will support the environment. I think it is totally dishonest to go about it in this way.

We have no way of knowing exactly what kind of money will be spent or how it will be spent. It is up to the prerogative of the government and in fact I should go right back to the legislation so that everyone clearly understands: "The net profits of the corporation after provision for prizes and the payment of expenses of operations shall be paid into the consolidated revenue fund at such times and in such manner as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may direct"—may direct—"to be available for appropriation by the Legislature for the promotion and development of physical fitness, sports, recreational and cultural activities and facilities"—this is the amendment that was spoken against by those groups—"for the activities of the Ontario Trillium Foundation," and now we add for environmental concerns under Bill 114, to be specific, "for the protection of the environment."

There was lots of money available to support environmental concerns and health care under the existing legislation, and it could have gone to community groups, non-profit groups, volunteer organizations that would have spent it for their concerns in their own community, and it would have made it very meaningful. Right now, anyone who came down and spoke before that committee would not even begin to come before the committee again because they know this government does not listen. Now we find ourselves with this smoke-and-mirrors promise that we will be using lottery dollars to support health and the environment and sports and recreation and culture and fitness when in fact the public, in the very beginning, was most happy with the bill the way it was.

I should go on to say the temptation to put his hand in the pot has become too great for the Treasurer. He has a point, but he certainly missed another point in the proposed legislation. Whatever happens to funding of sports, recreation and cultural activities? What will happen to them? That is the big question here today. Will levels of funding be maintained?

Mr Neumann: Yes.

Mrs Cunningham: Well, our party put forth an amendment to Bill 119 and asked for a specific dedication of funds to support sports, recreation and cultural activities. The opposition parties asked for a specific dedication of funds, of the \$500 million. I have to tell you, Mr Speaker, that we lost in committee. It was never considered by the Liberals to be something that they would promise as part of the legislation. The Treasurer stood up and made a promise in the committee that a certain amount of money—I think it was \$120 million—would be committed for three years; and I have to tell you that when it comes to keeping its promise, this government has absolutely no credibility.

On that point, Mr Speaker, I will leave the members who are here this afternoon listening to me speak on behalf of the public—who would love to come but they have lost confidence—time to think about the last remarks that I made.

The Deputy Speaker: I assume you are adjourning the debate.

Mrs Cunningham: I would do so, Mr Speaker, if that is appropriate at this time.

On motion by Mrs Cunningham, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1801.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaitre, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Hon Christine E.	York East	L	Minister of Culture and Communications
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	

Name	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing and Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Bob Mackenzie, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael Faman, Ed Fulton, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Faman, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Karl E. Morin-Storm, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray

Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Tuesday 29 May 1990

Members' statements			
Welland Historical Museum	1365	Plant closure	1373
Mr Kormos		Mr Adams	
Skills training	1365	Mr Elston	
Mrs Cunningham		Older worker adjustment program	1373
Robert Burns	1365	Mr Farnan	
Mr Tatham		Mr Phillips	
Case of Janice Laroque	1365	Ontario Hydro environmental assessments	1374
Miss Martel		Mr Cureatz	
Language debate	1365	Mrs McLeod	
Mr J. M. Johnson		Vandalism of Jewish cemeteries	1374
French-language services	1366	Mr Daigeler	
Mr Adams		Mr Wong	
Decentralization of government operations	1366	Northern development	1374
Mr Allen		Mr Wildman	
Job advertisements	1366	Mrs McLeod	
Mr McLean			
Vandalism of Jewish cemeteries	1366	Motion	
Mr Daigeler		Committee substitutions	1375
		Mr Offer	
Statement by the ministry		Agreed to	1375
Assistance to farmers	1366	Petitions	
Mr Ramsay		Religious education	1375
		Miss Roberts	
Responses		Reusable utensils	1375
Assistance to farmers	1367	Mr Adams	
Mr Wildman		First readings	
Mr Villeneuve		Employment Equity Act, 1990, Bill 172	1375
Mr McCague		Mr B. Rae	
		Agreed to	1375
Oral questions		Mental Health Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 173	1375
Employment equity	1368	Mr Callahan	
Mr B. Rae		Agreed to	1375
Mr Wong		Second reading	
Solid waste reduction	1368	Ontario Lottery Corporation Amendment Act, 1990,	
Mrs Grier		Bill 114	1375
Mr Bradley		Mr Black	1375
Landfill sites	1369	Ms Bryden	1375
Mr Harris		Mr Elliot	1379
Mr Bradley		Mr McLean	1379
Education financing	1370	Mr Laughren	1379
Mr Jackson		Mr Farnan	1380
Mr Conway		Mr Reycraft	1383
Labour dispute	1371	Mr D. S. Cooke	1383
Mr B. Rae		Mr Pouliot	1383
Mr Phillips		Mr Neumann	1383
Standing committee on general government	1371	Mr Kerrio	1384
Mr Runciman		Mr Ballinger	1391
Mr Peterson		Mrs Cunningham	1391
Ballet Opera House	1372	Adjourned	1393
Mr Owen		Other business	
Ms Hart		Ministerial statements	1367
Hospital financing	1372	Mr R. F. Johnston	1367
Mr Reville		Adjournment	1393
Mrs Caplan		Lists of members	
Municipal elections	1372	Members and their responsibilities	1394
Mr McLean		Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1397
Mr Sweeney			



38 90

38 90

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 30 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 30 mai 1990

Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 30 May 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

ISLAMIC DOCUMENTARY

Mr Kormos: Mr Speaker, watch tomorrow night 31 May at 7:30 pm on Vision TV. Vision TV down in Welland is carried by the Armstrong Cable network and is carried by cable companies not just across Ontario but across the country. Why Thursday 31 May at 7:30 pm is special is because it is the first of five half-hour documentaries on the Islamic faith written and developed by none other than John Giancarlo, a long-time Wellander, a person who established himself well in the community many years ago as an educator and, until his retirement in 1985, served as a dean of Niagara College of Applied Arts and Technology. Indeed, John Giancarlo was a founding dean of our community college in Welland in the Niagara Peninsula.

This series of five half-hour documentaries is incredibly insightful into the relationship between the Islamic religion and western religions, the influence of Islamic religion on our own and the relationship between the Muslim community and indeed, of all things, the Vatican. It is something not to be missed, Mr Speaker. I know you will be watching it, as I will, tomorrow night at 7:30.

BRIGID PYKE

Mr J. M. Johnson: All rural members of this House will be familiar with the contribution that Brigid Pyke has made to agriculture in Ontario. Her work on behalf of farmers, as president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, is particularly noteworthy at this time under an Ontario government which has placed such a low priority on agriculture.

After years of fighting for the legislation and programs that our farmers need to remain competitive in a changing world, Brock University is recognizing her leadership and contribution to agriculture by awarding her an honorary doctorate of laws. Honours such as this are normally granted to individuals at the end of distinguished careers, but in Brigid's case this is as much a recognition of things to come as it is of past achievements.

We in the Progressive Conservative Party and the rural caucus fully expect Brigid to continue to provide the same high quality of leadership to the agriculture community for many more years.

ADOPT-A-PARK

Mr Furlong: We in Durham continue to take a proactive role and demonstrate a keen interest in our environment. Today I want to bring to the attention of the members of the House one recent example of a unique environmental undertaking by the youth in the riding of Durham Centre.

In May of this year, adoption papers were drawn up between 17 public elementary schools and two high schools and 23 parks in the town of Whitby. Under the Adopt-a-Park program, the first of this nature in the province of Ontario, each Whitby school has adopted a park. Students ranging from four to 18 years of age visit their park and clean it up once a week during school hours.

This is a year-round program designed to raise public awareness. It is felt, and rightly so, that kids who spend time picking up after others are less likely to need others to pick up after them in the future. They will also be more aware of the damage that we do to our environment, having seen and cleaned up graphic examples.

Adopt-a-Park is the brainchild of Phil Long, principal of West Lynde Public School in Whitby, who, recognizing that the residents of his community were concerned about the general state of their parks, adhered to the philosophy that necessity is the mother of invention.

I know that my colleagues join me in extending congratulations to Mr Long and to these environmentally sensitive students in Whitby.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Miss Martel: On 2 May 1990, I asked the Minister of Labour what he planned to do in response to a recent ruling by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Tribunal with regard to gold mining claims.

The WCAT confirmed what most of us already know, that the Workers' Compensation Board uses the gold criteria to bar rather than extend compensation. Workers not meeting all of the policy guidelines do not qualify for benefits. In the vast majority of cases, the merits of the individual claim are not taken into account when a decision is made.

There is no doubt in my mind that this is how the board responds to most industrial disease claims as well. The board has criteria for other diseases such as silicosis, mesothelioma and asbestosis, and the pattern is the same in these cases. A worker qualifies for benefits if he or she meets all of the criteria. If not, the claim is rejected out of hand, even though a full investigation of the case might indicate it should be allowed.

Given this important ruling, the Minister of Labour should do two things: first, ensure that the WCB reviews all of the gold claims which have been denied to see if many more can be accepted based on their own merits; second, demand a review of all other industrial disease claims to determine if their rejection was premature as well. In this way, workers and/or their dependants could finally be assured that the facts of their individual case were taken into account in making a decision on benefits.

I believe many more cases could be won. Workers or their widows would finally receive the compensation they deserve.

OPP FACILITIES

Mr McLean: This concerns the recent announcement that the city of Orillia has been selected as the site for a massive new general headquarters complex for the Ontario Provincial Police. The 740 jobs and the accompanying \$35-million-a-year payroll was welcome news to the people of the sunshine city.

1340

It certainly restores my faith to know that the government ministers were listening on those many occasions when I suggested that the Huronia Regional Centre property could be used to build a facility to treat Alzheimer's patients or as a Workers'

Compensation Board rehabilitation and treatment centre or to house chronic care beds or for some other government agency.

It pleases me to know that my suggestions were not falling on deaf ears. I think a great deal of credit should go to the senior staff of the Solicitor General's office, the OPP and the Ministry of Government Services for the in-depth studies that resulted in the OPP coming to Orillia.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to the administration and staff of the Huronia Regional Centre and the Government Services office in Orillia for the efforts they put into this welcome announcement.

It was a pleasure to be on hand when the Premier and the Solicitor General visited Orillia on 18 May to announce that the sunshine city had been chosen as the new home for the OPP general headquarters. I would personally like to thank them for recognizing the benefits of building in Orillia, and especially for giving my earlier suggestions for the Huronia Regional Centre serious consideration.

DOCTORS' TRAINING

Mr Kozyra: It gives me great pleasure to call members' attention to a new medical training program announced for northern Ontario. On 22 May the Premier outlined a program to assist in the recruitment of physicians in northern communities. This program is both innovative and practical and involves two northern Ontario universities, Lakehead University and Laurentian University of Sudbury.

Statistical evidence reveals that physicians are more likely to practise in the area where they receive post-graduate clinical training rather than where they attend medical school. In keeping with this finding, medical school graduates will now have the opportunity to train in hospitals, clinics and doctors' offices throughout northern Ontario. As part of the program, post-graduate students will train in remote communities. It is part of an integrated strategy to decentralize health care and to expand training.

The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, after an intensive review, has recommended a mandatory two years of training before licensing. The ministries of Health, Colleges and Universities and Northern Development were involved in the development of this program, as were the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Ontario chapter of Family Physicians of Ontario and the Ontario Medical Association. In simple terms, this program should provide more family-practice doctors for northern Ontario communities, certainly a big step in the right direction.

COMPETITION AMONG SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr R. F. Johnston: A number of months ago I raised with the Minister of Education in this forum the problem that is taking place now as the school boards in the separate system and the public system are competing more and more to attract people to their systems. We now have public advertising on a regular basis being undertaken which would surely be acceptable, but we have also had the situation I raised at that point of the Windsor Roman Catholic Separate School Board putting a bounty on the heads of people, ratepayers, who come over and giving a reward to their own staff to go out to attract new ratepayers to their community.

I have just learned of a situation on the other side where public boards are a little upset because a prominent ski lodge that decided to change its support to the Catholic system, as was the right of that ski lodge to do, is now being boycotted for

school trips, and a major campaign against public boards using that facility is being promulgated around Ontario.

It strikes me, as it did at that time, that the Minister of Education should sit down with representatives of the various associations of boards in Ontario and set down some guidelines for what is acceptable in terms of the competition that is now going on to attract people into that system in terms of ratepayers and students.

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr Wiseman: Last weekend several commercial border crossings in Ontario were clogged by a blockade organized by frustrated truckers. It was the only way they knew to show this government what it had been told over and over again during the committee hearings on the trucking bills in 1988. I warned the previous Minister of Transportation at that time that our truckers, especially the small truckers, the owner-operators, simply could not compete under the conditions this government was laying down. Now the truckers who told him the same thing had to find other methods of letting his successor know that their American counterparts have all the advantages.

Our truckers cannot buy equipment at the low prices available to American truckers, so it would be a great help if this government would eliminate the 8% sales tax on the cost of trucks and trailers. It would also assist our Ontario truckers if it would give them a rebate on the provincial portion of the tax on diesel fuel.

These ideas are not new. I advanced them on behalf of the Ontario Trucking Association when Bill 88 was being debated two years ago. No one listened then. With plants being shut down, workers losing pay and productivity slowing, with produce rotting and costs being passed on to the consumer, is the minister finally listening now?

GAMES FOR THE DISABLED

Mr Cleary: I would like to take the opportunity to commend the city of Cornwall for hosting the Eastern Ontario Games for the Physically Disabled on 26 May 1990. I had the pleasure of sharing some time with 150 physically challenged participants as well as an equal number of supporters. The athletes were placed in categories. The games consisted of such traditional sports as track, field, swimming and weight-lifting.

While I was at the games, I could not help but feel an obvious sense of pride and determination. I believe it is individuals such as the participants in the eastern Ontario physically handicapped games who set an example of how to reach for our goals regardless of the problems we might face.

I would like to thank the organizers and all the supporters for the efforts they put forward into making these Eastern Ontario Games for the Physically Disabled such a success. I certainly hope this is one step along the way of heightening awareness in all the communities.

Most of all, I would like to congratulate the athletes themselves. I am pleased to note that three members of the Cornwall Handicap Club will be going to compete in the physically handicapped games in Etobicoke in July.

I would like to conclude by saying that I am proud to be part of the provincial government that makes this event such a success.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

LONG-TERM CARE

SOINS DE LONGUE DURÉE

Hon Mr Beer: On behalf of myself and my colleagues the Minister of Health, the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons and the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs, I wish to announce that the plan for the comprehensive reform of long-term care called Strategies for Change has been released today both in English and in French—Stratégies de réaménagement.

The strategies outlined in the plan will make major changes in our services to elderly people and people with disabilities. We will integrate in-home services, we will strengthen community agencies and supports so that people may retain their dignity and remain in their homes and communities as long as possible and we will provide for co-ordinated access to long-term care facility services.

Les stratégies énoncées dans le plan vont entraîner des changements profonds dans les services que nous offrons aux personnes âgées et aux personnes handicapées. Nous allons intégrer les services à domicile et nous allons renforcer les services de soutien et les organismes communautaires. Ceci permettra aux citoyens de préserver leur dignité et de continuer à vivre dans leur domicile et au sein de leur communauté le plus longtemps possible. Nous allons également pourvoir à la coordination de l'accès aux services de longue durée.

This government has demonstrated its commitment to the comprehensive reform of long-term care by assigning funding to the reform initiative in its 1990 budget. We will spend more than \$52 million in the current fiscal year. By the fiscal year 1996-97, new funding to improve services will increase to \$640 million annually.

Further, this government is committed to consultation and local planning. That is what this document is all about. Beginning immediately, we will be seeking advice from consumers, service providers, municipalities and voluntary organizations. Their assistance will be invaluable as we plan the implementation of Strategies for Change together.

Long-term care reform, a major health and social services initiative, is moving forward to improve the quality of life for disabled and senior citizens of Ontario.

1350

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

ÉTABLISSEMENTS CORRECTIONNELS

Hon Mr Patten: I am pleased to announce today the construction of a 120-bed addition to the Mimico Correctional Centre in Toronto's west end. This new remand accommodation will be used to house adult male inmates awaiting trial, sentencing or other judicial proceedings. As with most correctional facilities providing pre-trial detention, this new unit will have a maximum-security classification and will hold inmates charged with a wide range of offences.

Les députés de cette Assemblée sont bien conscients des défis auxquels mon ministère doit faire face.

Secure remand facilities for those being held while awaiting court appearances have been under pressure in recent years, particularly in the greater Toronto area. These pressures are mostly due to rapid population growth in the region, increased police enforcement against drug-related offences and our recog-

nition of and response, through criminalization, in such areas as domestic violence, sexual assault and drinking and driving.

Members will recall my announcement last December of the construction of a 272-bed remand detention unit to be added on to the Maplehurst Correctional Centre in Milton, which of course was to serve the rapidly developing areas of Peel, Dufferin and North Halton. I am pleased to note that the proposal call for the Maplehurst project has already closed and that we expect to see construction under way in the short term.

Le gouvernement a aussi fait l'annonce, l'année dernière, de la réaffectation de 136 places à des fins de détention provisoire au Centre correctionnel de Mimico.

Those beds are used for those awaiting further court appearances.

Other recent measures to deal with growing inmate populations in the greater Toronto area include the addition of 90 full-time staff positions to help supervise inmates at institutions where overcapacity has been a problem. Of course, these staff will remain in place as long as pressure on these facilities continues.

Construction of the Mimico detention expansion is expected to begin later this year and will take approximately 19 months to complete. Officials from the Ministry of Government Services will engage in discussions with the city of Etobicoke as we proceed with this project.

This facility, combined with other recent initiatives, as well as future directions being developed, represents a significant step towards the realization of the ministry's long-term capital plan which calls for the upgrading, renovation and expansion of a number of Ontario's 52 correctional institutes.

Ces mesures sont conformes aux principes établis par mon ministère dans sa planification générale à long terme.

I believe that the measures that I have announced today will play a substantial role in helping to reduce population pressures at the Toronto Jail, at the Metropolitan Toronto East Detention Centre and the Metropolitan Toronto West Detention Centre, as well as other remand centres in the province.

RESPONSES

LONG-TERM CARE

Mr Allen: I want to respond to the announcement of the Minister of Community and Social Services with regard to the development and funding of long-term care in Ontario and, in particular, his release of the document Strategies for Change, obviously a consultation document for those in the community interested.

Let me say first of all that this has been a question which has been of very vigorous debate and long-term lobbying by the disabled and the elderly in Ontario for many years. Certainly any movement in the direction of long-term care that emphasizes the independence and the capacity of the disabled and the elderly, not only to remain in their homes but to be active in the community, and indeed to work and seek and enjoy employment, is a very, very welcome move for those persons and for the whole tenor of community life in Ontario.

Without wanting to detract from the importance of this proposal, I would want to note that whereas three years ago, when we were going into an election, the government was announcing a very major completion of an integrated homemakers program which was intended to do many of these things, we are now about to go into another election with essentially a consultation in hand and no very hard specifics, no development of a program that would replace or augment the expansion of the

integrated homemakers program. However, I recognize that this is certainly much more than an integrated homemakers program. At least I hope it is.

I did not see in the minister's announcement specific reference to the development of workplace supports, attendant care in the workplace. I am hoping that this indeed is further on in this document than I have been able to get in the last two minutes and that not only will he be providing the supports for those individuals who wish to exercise their new-found independence with attendant care in the workplace but he will be doing two additional things.

I hope that he will be providing immediate funding for training programs for people who will be doing attendant care. This is obviously a more responsible kind of care than was implied in the older style of care for these people. It would be inappropriate to transfer those employed in earlier custodial and attendant care to the new task. The new task is going to be more complex, the support workers will have to be that much more informed and I hope the minister will be immediately looking at appropriate training.

Second, I hope he will be undertaking major initiatives with respect to the preparation of employers for the reception of the disabled, and indeed the elderly, who may wish to continue on a more limited basis with their handicaps some version of activity in a workplace setting. In that respect, in order for this reform to be significant, he will have to prepare the ground.

What the \$52 million will be devoted to immediately is not spelled out here, and I am a little concerned that the program does not reach its peak until 1996-97. After all, the last year was supposed to have been spent in consultation. When I read in the document that the first step in reform is to identify strategies that will provide essential components for an effective community care and support services system, I wonder what we have been doing over the last year. Surely that consultation had some meaning and content. I would have thought that particular question would have been resolved already.

Let the minister get on with great haste with this program because it is badly needed, badly wanted and long fought for by the disabled and elderly of Ontario.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Mr Farnan: In response to the Minister of Correctional Services, there is overstress in the system. I have to suggest to the minister that what he is promising today does not come on stream until 1992. That is the first thing.

The second item is that one third of the inmates in our prisons are in for fine violations. They should not be there. We do not have fine option programs in the province except for two small experiments. There is a backlog in the court system.

I can understand some emphasis in terms of renovation, but in terms of expanding a system that costs \$47,000 a year to house an inmate who should not be in prison, that is a waste of taxpayers' money. Twenty-five per cent of the inmates have psychiatric disorders. They need attention. That is where the government should be concentrating.

LONG-TERM CARE

Mrs Cunningham: I would like to respond to the Minister of Community and Social Services and his long-term care document today.

Obviously, we have not had a lot of time to take a look at these strategies for change as released by the minister and his ministry today. I will say that in the short period of time that we have had to look at this many of the observations, and especial-

ly the process, do refer directly to A New Agenda, which I believe was first released in 1986.

We were looking for very specific recommendations. We have not had time to look at it. I will ask the minister to respond sooner or later to the items that are for discussion in this document. It does give us some concern. As we take a look at discussion around the roles and responsibilities of specialized services in relation to the reformed service system, I would have expected more specific recommendations. With regard to the process of assessing consumers' ability to pay for support services, we thought that would have been looked at in the last four years. More specifically, we would have had some conclusions and recommendations around the discussion there.

As we take a look at discussion for the roles of various types of in-home service providers in the integrated in-home service program, new eligibility criteria for formal in-home services, those were the kinds of specific recommendations that we thought would have come out as a result of recommendations around Strategies for Change. I will speak specifically to one of the programs that we are very much concerned about.

The minister talked about \$52 million, assigning some \$7.4 million—I believe it is probably \$10 million—to fund the program for attendant care. I would say to the minister that we are looking at very specific and very extensive services there. Those are the kinds of services that the disabled have asked for. We know the minister has responded, but \$10 million will not begin to meet the needs as we know they exist today out there.

I will also say, having spent only a small amount of time reading this report, that we are sceptical of some of the changes and some of the strategies here. We would appreciate the opportunity to look at the report in more detail. That will be what we will do in the next day or so and get back to the minister.

1400

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Mr Cureatz: I would like to comment to the Minister of Correctional Services about his statement. Over the last number of months, he well knows, through various questions and private conversations, that we have been concerned on this side of the House about what would appear to be the lack of facilities in terms of housing the correctional population. We are very pleased with the announcement coming forward. We can only say it is probably in anticipation of an election, but we will forgive him for that because on this side of the House we are appreciative. We know how difficult it is for his ministry to garner funds from the Treasurer under the restraints that are taking place in the province of Ontario.

I want to bring to his attention, just for the few moments that we have left, on the last page of his announcement where he indicates, "This facility, combined with other recent initiatives, as well as future directions being developed, represent a significant step toward the realization of the ministry's long-term capital plan which calls for the upgrading, renovation and expansion of a number of Ontario's 52 correctional institutions."

I have brought to his attention a number of times, through letters and through questions in the House, the Whitby Jail. He is smiling, of course, because I think he anticipated my bringing in once again some concerns I have about the Whitby Jail. He has indicated to me, personally and through letters, that the sale of the jail would not even come close to what would be required for a new institution. I would like to bring to his attention that we are not asking for a new institution immediately, but we in

our community would look very favourably if his ministry took a hard look at what Mayor Attersley of the town of Whitby is saying, that the present institution—of course I have had the opportunity of visiting it with my colleague the member for Oshawa—is really outdated.

I give great laurels to those who are working in the institution, on staff and in the wards, in terms of trying to do the best possible, but if we are talking about rehabilitation, and I know the minister is because we have spoken often enough about this privately, it would go a long way to make a long-term plan of moving that facility, which is located in a prime area in terms of the town of Whitby, near the GO train station and the Whitby harbour. It could be sold and we could be looking at a long-term approach. We are not asking for it tomorrow but maybe within the next four to seven years.

Mr Reville: Mr Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent of the House to pay tribute to Elspeth Heyworth, who died yesterday.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Agreed to.

ELSPETH HEYWORTH

Mr Reville: I join with a number of communities across Metropolitan Toronto in mourning the death of Elspeth Heyworth. Yesterday her friends and co-workers and many of the people on whose behalf she worked as executive director of Dixon Hall gathered to try to cope with the terrible news that she had drowned off Goa, India.

Earlier this year, we had all been delighted that Elspeth had arranged to go on a kind of personal odyssey, a visit to her roots in England, where she went to school, and to India, where she was born. Since Monday we have been thinking about the many ways in which Elspeth has been important to our lives, and many of us are wondering what will become of the many projects on which we were working together with Elspeth.

Yesterday, a friend produced a copy of the June issue of Toronto Life magazine. "Read it aloud," we said, and we sat and tried to imagine Elspeth being interviewed by Rick Salutin and how impatient that must have made her. We wondered what she would have thought about the title of the article; it was called "Good for Goodness' Sake." We thought she might have pulled a very wry face indeed at the subtitle, "A Few Days on the Front Lines of Compassion."

The last few years had been both the best of times and the worst of times for Elspeth Heyworth. She was devastated by the breakup of her marriage. She was embroiled in many tough battles at the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, where she had been a director. But she did love her work at Dixon Hall, and she was excited about the possibilities that await in Ataratiri—which is the huge project the city is developing just south of Dixon Hall, where she worked—and she was helping to plan that project as a neighbour.

She was worried about the persistence of poverty in the context of 20 years of prosperity. She worried too about the tendencies of settlement houses to become agents of social control rather than social change. That is why she was happiest when the people she worked with found the strength to change their lives themselves and on their own terms, not according to some imposed and value-laden outside prescription.

I brought this book today from my library. It is by Michael Ignatieff. It is called *The Needs of Strangers*. It is an essay on privacy, solidarity and the politics of being human. This book reminds me of Elspeth, not just because of the way she lived

her life, but because of the way she thought about life. In his conclusion Michael Ignatieff says, in a chapter called "Homelessness and Belonging," "Our task is to find a language for our need for belonging which is not just a way of expressing nostalgia, fear and estrangement from modernity." It is my view that Elspeth had found that language and, what is more, she was teaching it to us. We will miss her.

Mrs Cunningham: It is with great sadness and a sense of loss that we rise today on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario to pay tribute to Elspeth Heyworth. For the last five years, Ms Heyworth had been the executive director of the Dixon Hall community centre and men's shelter. Today's newspapers reported across Canada that she drowned while vacationing at a resort in Goa, India.

Reading of her accomplishments, we feel a particular sense of loss. She was the type of person who is badly needed in today's society. Her concern for the poor and disadvantaged was evident to anyone who came in contact with her, even for a very short moment. She found great personal satisfaction in helping others. Her goal was to make major changes in people's lives and really turn things around by working with them as individuals. But she saw the problems, as many of us do, becoming bigger and bigger and much more severe, particularly with the homeless.

In addition to her work at Dixon Hall, Elspeth was a director of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority and a member of the neighbourhood advisory committee planning Ataratiri, an affordable housing project.

Born in India of English missionary parents, she went to boarding school in England and completed university there. Happily for us in Ontario, she and her husband came to Toronto in 1962 where she was an active social worker. She had three children, became a full-time mother and homemaker for a few years and totally dedicated her life to helping others.

Her death leaves a big gap in Toronto's community-minded citizens. It is hard to replace people of her calibre. In her words, "We've always tried to help people make major changes in their lives." Those who worked with her knew she could make it happen.

We express deep sympathy to her family in its sudden and unexpected sorrow.

1410

Hon Mr Scott: On behalf of the government, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing sympathy to Elspeth Heyworth's family. It is no exaggeration, as the honourable member for Riverdale has said, that when the announcement was made yesterday that she had drowned while on sabbatical near her native India, there were thousands of people in my riding and his riding and across Toronto who were heartbroken at what seemed a senseless and terribly unfair act of fate.

I knew Elspeth and her then husband Peter Heyworth and their young family well. They lived two houses away from me on Carlton Street, and when I came there, a middle-aged lawyer, they sought to involve me in community affairs. The first task assigned was Elspeth's invitation to lie down in front of a tractor that was about to reduce the perimeter of Riverdale Park. Those who know Elspeth would understand that it was easier to lie down than not to. The expansion of the park, through her efforts, was terminated.

She had a distinguished academic career and was a graduate of Osgoode Hall Law School and a staff member at York University for some time, but it was a matter of surprise to even her greatest friends when she decided to respond to an adver-

tisement in the Toronto Globe and Mail which advertised the position of executive director of Dixon Hall in Toronto. Dixon Hall, as honourable members will know, is one of the oldest settlement houses, as they used to be called, in the city and is an important feature of community life in the south part of the city, in particular St George-St David and Riverdale.

I say it was unusual that she would make such an application because if there was ever an incongruous applicant for such a job it was Elspeth. She was a Brit, if the honourable member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore will forgive me for saying that, the daughter of English people in India and a graduate of Oxford. She had spent all her life in her home bringing up her children and in the scholarly halls of the university. She gave the sardonic reply, when asked why she had applied, that it was within walking distance. But the reality was that in making that application and in taking the job that was ultimately forthcoming, Elspeth responded to a deep need to serve her community in a variety of ways.

In the five years she was the executive director of Dixon Hall, she initiated a wide number of programs, exhibited the most imaginative capacity to achieve government support from all three levels, against the advice, even, occasionally, of the member for Riverdale and myself, she worked assiduously with the community and she served the community in a variety of other ways. At the request of the community, she became our director at Wellesley Hospital to try to make that hospital a great community resource. She served as chairman of the community planning committee for Ataratiri and, as the honourable member for Riverdale has noted, was a major mainstay of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority.

The happy and vibrant article that Rick Salutin wrote about her in Toronto Life this month unhappily becomes her memorial.

I think the message of Elspeth's life to her neighbours is that you have an obligation in the community to help others who are less fortunate than yourself and you do that by helping them to organize themselves, helping them to plan for themselves, helping them to teach themselves and helping them to support themselves. That was, for her neighbours and her friends in my community, the message of Elspeth's career and her life. The people at Dixon Hall with whom she worked in the community will miss her dreadfully, as will we all.

The Speaker: I will, on behalf of all members, make certain that her family will learn of your words of respect and sympathy. As soon as Hansard is officially printed, I will see that a copy is sent.

Mr B. Rae: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Like everyone else around here, I am in receipt of a news release dated 30 May in which it is stated that the Premier has accepted the resignation of the Minister of Culture and Communications and simply encloses a letter from the member for York East to the Premier of the province, which letter, if I may say so, explains nothing. I wonder if the Premier can tell us why there has been no statement from the minister as to why she has resigned or why—

The Speaker: Order. I had not called for questions, and I believe that was a question. You rose on a point of order. I certainly am ready to acknowledge any member who rises in his or her place.

VISITOR

The Speaker: I would draw to the members' attention that we have a visitor in the lower west gallery, a former member, Milton (Bud) Gregory.

ORAL QUESTIONS

RESIGNATION OF CABINET MINISTER

Mr B. Rae: As I said in my point of order, I would have expected that a resignation of a minister in the cabinet, a minister of the crown, would be at least explained to the House. It is not a private arrangement between the Premier and a member of his caucus, it is a matter of public record and of public importance in terms of why a minister has made this decision. I wonder if the Premier can tell us everything he knows about the circumstances surrounding the resignation of the Minister of Culture and Communications.

Hon Mr Peterson: The minister was involved in a nomination contest in her own riding. She accepted services and goods from certain potential clients under her ministry. I felt this was very bad judgement.

Mr B. Rae: The letter from the minister says, "As you are aware, I am very concerned about allegations that have surfaced concerning requests made in the context of my nomination as Liberal candidate in York East."

Can the Premier tell us what was the nature of the services that were either offered or asked for, the circumstances surrounding this and which clients or potential clients are involved?

Again, this is not a matter internal to the Liberal Party of Ontario, this is a matter involving a minister. The Premier believes it involved a bad judgement on the part of the minister. I think we are entitled to have at least on the record some information as to what transpired.

When did the Premier meet with the minister? What did she tell him? Did he ask for her resignation? What were all the circumstances? Surely we are entitled to this information.

Hon Mr Peterson: Yesterday, about this matter, I had it looked at in all the details by staff, I met with her this morning and she has resigned. There is nothing illegal in what was done, but, in my opinion, it was a very bad judgement. It was two particular clients, Bell Canada and CNCP telegraph. As the member knows, there is a large regulatory matter that will have to be dealt with by the CRTC, but Ontario will be putting forth a position at some point in the future. It was not significant, it was a matter of some telephones and some staff, but I felt this was a bad judgement.

Mr B. Rae: I do not know why we have to get all this by the back door. Am I to understand from what the Premier is telling me—

Interjections.

Mr B. Rae: Why is there no statement? There is no statement here. What was the nature of the services offered by Bell Canada and by CNCP telegraph to the minister? What was the nature of the services offered? What were all the circumstances?

I do not think we are asking for anything unusual or untoward. We are simply saying we should not have to ask questions about something as fundamental as this. Why can the Premier not tell us exactly what is involved in terms of the services being offered, all the circumstances involving when

this took place, how this took place, at what point, so that this can then be a matter of public record?

Hon Mr Peterson: There are no secrets about it. You need only ask. There was a matter of some six, I believe, cellular telephones. There was some staff from Bell Canada who did work after hours, not on company hours, but, again, I felt that was inappropriate. It was on a phone bank for a nomination. Those are the circumstances and I came to the conclusion, as I said, it was not illegal but, in my view, bad judgement.

1420

CONSTITUTIONAL ACCORD

Mr B. Rae: While we are talking on the subject of bad judgement, the Premier will no doubt be aware of the story contained across Canada in Southam News, a story entitled, in the version that I have, "Ontario Plotting Strategy," which refers to what has been referred to by officials in the government as a working document on Meech Lake, which says that Ontario should have several goals, two of which would be to fuel a sense of crisis and, second, to undermine the credibility of Clyde Wells, Gary Filmon and New Brunswick's Frank McKenna. I wonder if the Premier can tell us if this kind of working document is an approach which he feels will help to build a spirit of national unity in the country.

Hon Mr Peterson: Absolutely not; it does not help at all. It was a document that I had not seen. I was not aware of it until I came in this morning. I tracked it down. It apparently was done by a couple of junior-level bureaucrats and was rejected. It was not part of our strategy, and the member is quite right, it is not constructive. It is one of the stupidest things I have ever seen in government, and there are on occasion a lot of stupid things done in government.

Mr Wildman: A couple of file clerks.

Mr B. Rae: These file clerks who produced this tasteless document, which no one has ever seen before—the Premier this morning said he was not even sure if it existed, and then his principal secretary said if they find out who released the document, they will be charged with breach of trust. It is the first time that anyone will have been charged with breach of trust for a document that does not exist.

I want to ask the Premier, since he is not prepared to tell us the circumstances surrounding this document, perhaps he can tell us exactly who prepared this document, with whom this document has been discussed and, if he is now disowning the document, precisely what discussions regarding this document have in fact taken place.

Hon Mr Peterson: Apparently it was prepared by a couple of junior bureaucrats last week.

Mr B. Rae: Who?

Hon Mr Peterson: I do not know the names at this moment, but the honourable member can believe me that I am trying to find out. Nobody commissioned it. Everybody is—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Peterson: It was rejected at a committee, I was not aware of it until this morning, and that is the most I can assist.

Mr R. F. Johnston: You can't trust those GO Temps, can you?

Hon Mr Peterson: Well, I get the impression some days that the guys who wrote that report are the same people who write the questions for question period.

Mr B. Rae: I would have thought it would have been obvious by now that no one writes my questions for question period.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The question?

Mr B. Rae: I want to say by way of final supplementary this is the first government document I know which is produced by means of immaculate conception by people who have no names, people who do not exist, and yet if anyone finds out who actually released this non-existent document which no one will take responsibility for, they will be fired. These nameless, faceless orphans will be out on the street. We do not know who produced it. Nevertheless, I think it says something about the political culture of this government.

I want to ask the Premier, who is in charge, who is responsible for this document? Who is it in his office or within the Liberal Party, or within the office of the Attorney General, his top constitutional adviser, who could possibly have produced nonsense such as this that says you have to portray one of the premiers as politically erratic and inconsistent, you have to insist that another person's concerns are out of proportion, insist that another Premier has to be described as part of the problem, and says that all the while this dirty work is being done the Premier should simply continue to take the high road to nation-building and stay off substance issues? God knows this Premier has avoided substance issues for five years. I want to ask the Premier, who is responsible for this document, and if he does not know, why does he not know?

Hon Mr Peterson: I will try to find the names of the people who wrote this thing and I will send them on to the member, and I will send them a copy of Hansard as well so they understand his view of them. I share most of the things that he has said about that document.

Mr Harris: The Premier was one of the signatories to the Meech Lake accord. Part of the agreement he signed was that all 10 provinces would ratify the accord by 23 June and that all premiers must be in agreement.

We too were distressed to read that the Office of the Premier is suggesting Ontario should be undermining the credibility of the other provinces, manipulating the media and calling other premiers erratic and unpredictable. The Premier would agree, and I have heard him agree with the Leader of the Opposition today, that this is not the traditional role of premiers of this province. It is not the type of game that the government of Ontario should be playing with our fellow Canadians. Who is advising the Premier on his strategy for Ontario on Meech Lake, and did they know of this document?

Hon Mr Peterson: The member is quite right, we should not be calling anybody erratic and unpredictable, except perhaps the leaders of the opposition parties around here; I agree with that.

Let me say to my honourable friend that this was produced and rejected at some meeting or other. I was not aware of it. The Attorney General, who is my chief adviser on these matters, was not aware of it. Like many other working documents going around government, I guess it did not go anywhere.

Mr Harris: What is very disconcerting to me is, when I read the story and I reviewed the events and the Premier's

statements over this past week, “‘Quebec will never be left to stand alone in future constitutional talks,’ Premier David Peterson vowed yesterday,” it matches identically with strategy point 1 in the leaked document he disavows, which is to prevent the isolation of Quebec.

“But Peterson was quick to blame Newfoundland Premier Clyde Wells for the current stalemate: ‘Mr Wells has to remember that his predecessor signed this and he is the one that rescinded that motion and he’s got a very heavy responsibility.’”

This was on Sunday. It seems to fit identically with, “We’ve urged the media to keep constant pressure on holdout premiers by questioning them on the consequences of failure and the responsibility for it.” On Sunday the Premier warned Canada could break apart unless there is compromise by Wells, Manitoba’s Gary Filmon and Frank McKenna of New Brunswick.

Strategy point 3 is to escalate the national crisis.

What is disconcerting to me is that as I have reviewed the Premier’s comments of the past week, they appear to fit exactly with the strategy that we see being leaked as Ontario’s strategy that he now disavows any knowledge of. Again, who is giving him the advice that this is a strategy he should follow?

Hon Mr Peterson: The answer is, I take advice from all sorts of sources. I take advice from the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the Leader of the Opposition and a variety of other people. When people come forward with good ideas, I am delighted to adopt and embrace them. My chief adviser in this matter, as the member knows, is the Attorney General, who has a very strong group of constitutional lawyers and political scientists working with him.

My honourable friend, I am sure, suffers the same dilemma that I do. He gets advice on all sides of every issue almost every day. Ultimately, one then makes one’s own decision.

As I have told my honourable friend, I disavow this particular document because I think it was rather juvenile, out of date and, frankly, quite stupid.

Mr Harris: I think the Premier has agreed with the Leader of the Opposition and myself that this strategy is divisive, totally inappropriate and very counterproductive to his role as Premier of this province.

This strategy outlined in the document is vintage Peterson and is very similar to strategies in dealing with a number of domestic problems. Given that this strategy, which appears to have been followed on the weekend, is a strategy that the Premier has followed for domestic problems—and I accept what he is saying to me today that it is totally inappropriate when dealing with fellow premiers and on the national stage—and given the urgency and the situation this country is in, I find it very difficult to accept that the Premier does not know who wrote this report, that he does not know who had access to this report and that he does not know which advisers who have been advising him on his strategy had access to this report.

First, when is the Premier going to find out, and second, will these people—assuming maybe one of them is the Attorney General, I do not know—assure us that there is no place for them in the cabinet—

The Speaker: Order.

1430

Hon Mr Peterson: Nobody advised me to do any of that, just so the member understands. That was never advice that came to me, nor if it did is it advice that I would follow, as my honourable friend knows. So I think he can rest assured that is

not the case, and he will sleep well tonight knowing that the province is in good hands.

RESIGNATION OF CABINET MINISTER

Mr Harris: I am very concerned today as well that there was no statement, nothing forthcoming to the House, concerning the resignation of a senior minister of the crown.

The Speaker: The question is to whom?

Mr Harris: To the Premier. I do not accept the Premier’s suggestion to the leader of the official opposition that all the information is forthcoming and that something of this significance should have to be asked about in question period.

The Premier, in response to the leader of the official opposition, talked about services that were provided to his minister for a nomination bid. The information that I had seen in the release talked about the time and the appropriateness of the companies those people work for. The Premier has indicated something new to me in this House, that there were services that were provided as well.

Does the Premier know where those services came from and which employees provided them? How far up the ladder are we with these two companies that were involved in this renomination?

Hon Mr Peterson: I have told my honourable friend everything I know. I gather there were four employees, to the best of my knowledge, from Bell Canada who worked on their own time. It was not on company time and perhaps I gave the member the false impression by using that word “services.” Those are the facts as I know them.

Mr Harris: In response to the question, I believe the Premier talked about a phone bank or some communications equipment. Did this equipment belong to those four employees? Did they have authorization to provide this equipment or was the Premier in error when he talked about this equipment as being provided to the nomination bid of his minister as well?

Hon Mr Peterson: It was a different company that, I could gather, lent them some cellular telephones.

Mr Harris: Then are we involved with a third company that is in the communications business, that would have communications equipment available? Does the Premier have details of that?

When I read the resignation letter I was a little perplexed, if these were four very junior employees working on their own time with no connection or access to the company, that the Premier should automatically deem that very inappropriate without any further investigation and perceive that as a conflict. I can only conclude that there is more to this and I regret that I have to keep asking questions in this House to get at it.

The Premier said there was another company that provided the equipment. Can he tell us the name of that other company, what was the equipment that was involved and who authorized it?

Hon Mr Peterson: I said all that in the House in response to the Leader of the Opposition but I will repeat it for my honourable friend. The member understands the situation with the employees of Bell Canada. They were not being paid by Bell Canada, as I understand it. They were on their own time. So my honourable friend may disagree with the judgement that I made in this case and may think that we displayed, shall we say, too much rectitude in that particular judgement. That is fair enough because there are not conflict-of-interest rules applying

to a nomination as my honourable friend knows. There is clearly no violation of the law but I felt it was an error of judgement.

The second company, and I referred to it earlier, was CNCP, Cantel Communications, and as the member knows there is a large regulatory issue now that will go to the CRTC with respect to long-distance rates and things like that. That is why I made the judgement I did. I did not feel, even though it was not against the law, that it was in good judgement to deal with, shall we say, clients of the ministry in this way, because the judgements that would be made have to be made dispassionately and objectively. I thought it was much better to be prudent in the circumstances. This is a harsh business and I regret it very much, but I think the public interest is best served by that resignation today.

SOLID WASTE REDUCTION

Mrs Grier: I have an environmental question for the Premier. In questions this week to the Minister of the Environment I have been trying to get from that minister a commitment to implement programs to reduce the amount of garbage we as a society produce. Yesterday the minister acknowledged that excess packaging is a major contributor to the garbage crisis. In fact, in response to a question from one of his own backbenchers last November on this very subject the minister said he had asked the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers and the federal government to establish federal packaging legislation and was hopeful of a report in March 1990 which would stipulate regulation and legislation in this regard.

When that federal packaging protocol in fact appeared in March it did not contain the regulation or the legislation that the Premier's minister said he was seeking. It in fact calls for more studies, for more consultations, for more technical reports.

Can the Premier explain why his government is content to wait for further studies and action by a federal government that has shown no environmental commitment? Why is his government not prepared to act to reduce excess packaging in Ontario?

Hon Mr Peterson: I do not think the minister ever ruled out unilateral action in this regard, by any stretch of the imagination. But my honourable friend I know is reasonable enough to understand that these things are better done on a national basis. It is just like the question we go into on air standards. Is it not more appropriate, if possible, to move with neighbouring states, to move with other parts of the continent? These are transborder problems, many of them, as my honourable friend knows. It is much more efficient, as my honourable friend knows, to make sure that companies have an opportunity to do this on a national basis. The honourable minister has been the leader in pushing for national standards. It is not always easy moving along the process, but I can tell my honourable friend by no stretch of the imagination is unilateral action ruled out, if necessary.

Mrs Grier: What I am trying to get from the Premier and from the government is some sense of when it is appropriate to move unilaterally and when they are content to sit back and wait for the federal government. When it came to smog-free gas, national standards would have been preferable, but the minister is trumpeting his initiative. It is the same with measures to reduce CFCs released into the atmosphere—Ontario is in the lead, according to our minister; we do not have to wait for the federal government. Last October the minister told the media that Ontario could draft its own packaging regulations if Ottawa does not move.

The Premier must know that one of the simplest kinds of packaging that is entirely within the jurisdiction of this province to reduce is beverage containers of all kinds. Is he not ashamed that when one buys soft drinks in a non-refillable container the label says "Return for refund in Quebec, 5 cents," but in Ontario two out of three of them go into the garbage—

The Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mrs Grier: Does that not shame the Premier?

The Speaker: Order.

Mrs Grier: Is he not prepared to take action now?

The Speaker: Order. I am afraid you will throw the bottle.

Hon Mr Peterson: Maybe for the first time I heard her trumpet the achievements of the Minister of the Environment. I am not sure if she wanted to do this, but did she not stand up and say that Ontario was first in CFCs? Did she not say that? Did she not say that Ontario was first with the blue box, the leader in North America today? I think she said that, did she not? Did she not say that Ontario was the first with respect to acid rain controls and so many other things?

I think that finally we have found an ounce of charity in the critic opposite, and we recognize the leadership that Ontario has played in all of these matters. My honourable friend, a typical socialist, always wants more, and I understand that. I should tell the Speaker this: I unwittingly said something charitable about the honourable member in this House one time and she used it in her last campaign brochure. I am going to use her speech just now in this House in our campaign brochure.

1440

STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Mrs Cunningham: I have a question for the Minister of Education that should be of special interest to the Minister of Community and Social Services, as well.

The Kitchener-Waterloo Record reported that some schools were confining students in time-out boxes as punishment for unruly behaviour. The students, sometimes as young as 10 years of age, are put in three-sided partitions which are closed on the fourth side when pushed against a wall. One child was kept in a box in a room with the lights off for more than an hour—this was last week. The fourth side was boxed off with filing cabinets and if there had been a fire, the child would have been trapped.

Does the minister really feel that this is an appropriate method of dealing with trouble children in our schools?

Hon Mr Conway: I think it must be said that the school community over the years has developed in the main very good practices in coping with its several responsibilities. I have been, in very recent days, made aware of the situation as reported, to which the honourable member makes reference, and I have asked my officials for an update as to what actually occurred. When I have that information, I will be very happy to share it with my friend the member for London North.

Mrs Cunningham: Teachers, as the minister knows, can spend as much as 40% of their day trying to restore order in the classroom. His own assistant deputy minister acknowledged problems in a recent interview by saying that a study showed 18% of children aged four to 16 have emotional problems requiring professional assistance, but it is a tragedy that only one in six gets any help.

Recently, in North York, a principal said that teachers have not been trained to handle violence at all. They are not trained to deal with the kid who is openly disobedient. They are not trained to handle depression, but we have a lot of sad kids out there. That was a principal in North York.

We know, at the same time, that children's mental health institutions are turning away these children. They are telling school boards: "Make no more referrals. We have no more space. We have long waiting lists."

When are school boards going to get the social workers' support that they need to deal with the realities of today's classrooms? It is a real need.

Hon Mr Conway: The record of the ministry and of school boards across the province, I think, has been quite good in responding to a number of the emerging needs. There is no question that our modern society places all kinds of stresses and strains upon the school community.

But I can tell my honourable friend something that I am sure she is more than passingly aware of. That is, in my recent travels across the province during Education Week, in communities like North Bay, Oshawa and southwestern Ontario, I was quite impressed to see and to hear of many of the very creative initiatives that teachers, principals and others associated with the school community have undertaken, often in concert with partners in the social service community.

Obviously, more remains to be done and we look forward to working together with all in the school and social service community to ensure that young people, particularly young people at risk, receive every attention and all support that we can possibly and reasonably provide.

REGULATION OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr M. C. Ray: I have a question for the Minister of Financial Institutions. It concerns the regulation of trust companies and insurance companies in Ontario. The minister has been involved in an initiative with the federal government and will know the importance of regulating trust companies and insurance companies and bringing into harmony the regulations of these institutions at the federal and provincial levels.

I understand there has been a delay at the federal level and would like the minister to update us with respect to these negotiations with the federal government and advise when we can expect some action on this matter.

Hon Mr Elston: The honourable gentlemen is right that we have for some time been pursuing harmonization with respect to regulation of financial institutions across Canada. I should make it very clear that the working relationship to deal with harmonization of regulation has really been between or among the provinces and the territories, to the extent that we can do so, and although the federal government has been invited from time to time to be at the table, it has not yet been able to attend.

We have in fact signed a harmonization agreement or at least an information-sharing agreement about our regulation of various companies, but the federal government has not joined in that information-sharing document.

We have also been waiting for the introduction of new legislation at the federal level and have been advised that before it comes in, the current junior minister, M. Loiselle, will, as we had understood originally, meet with us to discuss what was contained in it. We do not know the status of his current disposition towards those meetings or indeed when he will intro-

duce the legislation, but we have heard from time to time that it will be coming soon.

Mr M. C. Ray: In the meantime I would like to know, what protection is there for the public as we witness insurance companies, trust companies, banks and stockbrokers invading each other's traditional market area? What can the minister advise us with respect to protection of the public?

Hon Mr Elston: With respect to protection of the public, there are of course deposit-taking institutions that are insured through the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp and that have aggressively marketed their activities. In addition to that, there has been co-operation between the various provinces as we deal with how a company is performing in our various jurisdictions. We are exchanging the information to promote an understanding of the solvency of each of those organizations as our regulators check activity.

We are also watching very diligently the developments at the federal level in particular, where it is allowing certain corporations to come into Canada and do certain things that our native organizations believe they cannot do, and help to promote the best interests of our Canadian institutions so that they remain strong.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION FINANCING

Mr Philip: I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities and Minister of Skills Development. The minister will recall his recent statement in this House, where he stated it was his belief that it is vital that we enhance technical studies in this province through the province's various technical education systems.

I wonder if the minister can tell us, does he believe his own statement? If he does, how does he contrast that with the cutbacks to Humber College, the layoff of teachers and the cutback in the number of hours per student at Humber College, thanks to his government?

Hon Mr Conway: I must say to my friend the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale that he surely must understand that I believe what I say. I do not like to see my friend from Rexdale so pained in his expression and so accusatory in his tone, because I know him to be quite otherwise.

He would know, for example, that Humber this year will receive something like \$2 million more than it received last year. I think its operating grant this year is up over \$55 million—\$2 million-plus up from what it was last year. I have to tell him that this, together with a number of other initiatives the government has taken—we have indicated, for example, that some \$60 million will be spent in the next little while to renew technological studies at the secondary level—indicates very clearly not only that the government is reinforcing the first order of importance of technological studies across our school system, but that substantial new resources are being made available to high schools and to colleges to ensure that this can take place.

The Speaker: There are quite a number of conversations. I am enjoying them here, but I do not think many other people are.

Mr Philip: The Minister of Skills Development seems to be very boastful of his increase to Humber College in the operating grants. Does he not realize that the increase for the coming year will amount to 1.29%, hardly the rate of inflation? Does he not accept that for the next year the training and grants

from his ministry are estimated to decrease by a minimum of 33.5%, or some \$2,272,631 over last year?

How can the minister talk about quality education when he is really cutting back on grants to colleges and universities, when he is cutting back in real terms to Humber College and when he is raising the student-teacher ratio, and teachers are being laid off? How is that quality education?

1450

Hon Mr Conway: I must say again to my friend the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale that the facts are otherwise. The facts are system-wide. This year we will increase by 8% our operating support for colleges.

It is true, I must say to my friend the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale that colleges, with their boards, have a responsibility to manage their individual institutions and the programs that make up those institutions. It is also true to say that there are managers throughout the system who are not the kind of antediluvian conservatives that one often finds in the New Democratic Party, who are hopelessly and totally resistant to any kind of change.

Things do change and, yes, some programs are adjusted. Some programs are even discontinued so that other, new initiatives can be undertaken. It seems to be the view of my friend from Rexdale that a cutback is any program that any manager or any board ever decides to alter, to amend, perhaps even to discontinue.

I repeat that, overall, we are increasing our support by 8% to the system. Humber, this year, will receive over \$2 million more in operating support than it got last year, at a time when its enrolment growth on a full-time equivalent basis is not as strong as the provincial average. We will perhaps see what that leads my friend to ask next time.

FARM TAX REBATE

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Premier about his government's gutting of the farm tax rebate program last year. The change in criteria slashed about \$50 million from the government's farm tax rebate program. The Premier will know that in response to an angry outcry from the agricultural community about slashing the eligibility without any consultation, his government initiated a review of the program. That was commissioned in June 1989.

I have here a copy of that confidential report. It has been sitting on the minister's desk since 11 April. It states clearly that the changes made by his government were wrong. In view of this information, is the Premier now prepared to accept the committee's recommendation that he reinstate the farm tax rebate as it was always intended, as a universal program available to all farmers?

Hon Mr Peterson: The Minister of Agriculture and Food can help out my friend.

Hon Mr Ramsay: The member opposite is quite right that the government embarked upon a consultation study last year, and I am taking that study into serious consideration in making recommendations for a program this year. I would just like to assure the member that there is going to be a farm tax rebate program this year. Thanks to the Treasurer, we have \$7 million more than the \$140 million that we spent last year in that program.

Mr Harris: They slashed \$50 million last year. It would have been about \$100 million this year. He added \$7 million, and he says, "Thank you." It is what happens when the govern-

ment makes unilateral decisions without consultation. It made a bad decision. Clearly, the independent report says it was wrong. We now have informed advice from the special committee that has studied the matter. They have told the government to change the policy. The committee has concurred with my position, with my party's position and with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture's position that this program is designed to reflect the true value of farm land for assessment purposes, that it is not a vehicle for farm support, that it is not a welfare program.

When farmers appealed to the Premier, he sloughed them off. Will the minister not admit today that he was wrong to treat the program as a welfare benefit, as he did, and will he give us assurance today that he will act immediately to adopt the recommendations contained in this report?

Hon Mr Ramsay: I think it would be very important for the member opposite to give the government some credit for doing two things. Number one, I do not think the member opposite should be sloughing off an expenditure of this government to farmers in Ontario of \$147 million. That shows we care about agriculture in this province.

The other thing is, we do consult with the people of Ontario. We had consultations and, as I said to the honourable member, we will be taking those into consideration later on.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Ms Oddie Munro: My question is for the Minister of Energy. I recently met with a group of workers from Camco, Hamilton, representing the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of Canada. They were very much interested in the status of a union proposal regarding Ontario Hydro's entering into joint ventures with Ontario appliance industries. I believe that in December 1989 the critic from the New Democratic Party, the member for Hamilton Mountain, tabled that proposal, not only before Ontario Hydro but before Camco. I am wondering if she could inform me as to the status of that proposal.

Hon Mrs McLeod: That proposal has indeed been of interest, both to the Ministry of Energy and also to Ontario Hydro, since I think we share a goal of wanting to encourage Ontarians to replace inefficient refrigerators with more energy-efficient refrigerators.

It is my understanding that Ontario Hydro, since hearing of that proposal, has been involved in discussions with appliance manufacturers in terms of their production and the availability of energy-efficient refrigerators, but is also investigating programs that could be put in place that would provide encouragement for people to shift from the inefficient models to more efficient models. Those programs would certainly include information and might also include incentives.

Ms Oddie Munro: I was indeed impressed with the knowledge and the dedication of the workers who came before me, and I do hope this has some immediate effect on the workers at Camco, in addition to the appliance industry itself.

I understand that some new energy efficiency regulations have been introduced by the Ministry of Energy and I am wondering if the minister could explain what effect these regulations will have on Ontario appliance manufacturers.

Hon Mrs McLeod: Indeed, it is correct that a number of appliances have been regulated under the new Energy Efficiency Act. The regulations that have been developed have been done in consultation with appliance manufacturers so that we could ensure that the manufacturers in Ontario could in fact

meet both the requirements in the regulations and also what we believe will be consumer demand for those energy-efficient appliances.

The regulations on refrigerators are, in particular, acknowledged to be phased in. By 1994 the regulations will parallel the stringent regulations of the United States. This phasing in was done in order to ensure that the Ontario manufacturers could have an opportunity to enter the United States market, as well as provide for Ontario consumers.

INQUESTS

Mr Mackenzie: I have a question of the Solicitor General. Back on 2 April I asked the minister why the United Steelworkers' union had to wait 17 or 18 months with no inquest being called in the death of G. Mertins at the Campbell Red Lake mine. Finally, on 11 April, an inquest was held. The minister will be aware that the ground shake caused the problem, caused the workers to be pulled out of the Dickenson mine next door as well, because both mines are in the same ore body. These workers are represented by the United Steelworkers of America.

Can the minister tell us why Bob Bainbridge of the United Steelworkers' union, who went to Campbell Red Lake for the purpose of attending the inquest, was denied standing? Who was responsible for this decision and why?

Hon Mr Offer: In any coroner's inquest, there is always a question of standing, who is given standing, and those particular representations are made before the regional coroner conducting the inquest. It is within the jurisdiction of the coroner to determine in any one particular circumstance who should or should not be given standing, based on his or her own particular reason and opinion.

That is a usual function of the coroners in the conducting of any inquest. They take that particular function very seriously, as they do all of their functions. They are difficult decisions. They are weighed in every particular matter, and the coroners make those decisions accordingly.

1500

Mr Mackenzie: It does not really sound like it was weighed in this case, because there was certainly a direct interest of the next door mine.

The minister is aware of the growing concern over the number of deaths in the workplace and of the difficulty in getting inquests and the long delays before they are held. Is the minister prepared to hold an inquest in all industrial deaths, as he has been asked to do on a number of occasions, and will he take steps to end the long delays in the current inquests that are held?

Hon Mr Offer: In many ways I share the honourable member's concern dealing with determination as to whether an inquest is to take place and, if so, when that inquest is scheduled to be heard. I think the member should be aware that there are, in many cases, ongoing investigations which must be conducted. There are issues which must be addressed and there are, in many cases, other ancillary questions which also must be answered. I share the member's concern that when those particular preliminary types of questions are answered, the inquest be carried on as quickly and expeditiously as possible. I view as very important in carrying out the function and the mandate of the coroners.

The Speaker: New question, the member for Markham.

Hon Mr Scott: Wait for it. Here comes a question on rent controls from the Tories. Maybe pay equity—no, rent control.

The Speaker: I want to make certain the Attorney General is finished.

Mr Cousens: I would like to ask a question that this minister would answer, but he would not know how to answer anything.

The Speaker: New question, and to which minister?

Mr Cousens: I do not envy you with your job, trying to keep control of these people.

GREATER TORONTO AREA RAPID TRANSIT

Mr Cousens: My question is for the Minister of Transportation. The minister is aware that as chairman of the Ontario Conservative Party's task force on transportation, I yesterday had the pleasure of meeting with the Toronto Transit Commission. At that meeting there was some receptivity to our suggestion that there be a tax credit for commuters who purchase TTC and GO Transit passes. This would encourage greater use of public transit, and a number of people see some benefit in that.

Has the ministry any plans to introduce this type of program of a tax credit to encourage people to use public transit?

Hon Mr Wrye: I would just indicate that this is a question that the honourable member might more properly address to the Treasurer. It is my responsibility as part of the government, and I think with the support of the Premier, the Treasurer and all of my colleagues, we are trying to carry out my responsibility, which is to ensure the finest public transit system in North America.

We are well on the way to doing that. I am sure the TTC told the member that yesterday. I know, with the member's support and the support of all members of the House, we will go forward in that regard.

In terms of tax credits, that is a matter the Treasurer may wish to take under consideration.

Mr Cousens: The minister should not pass the buck. The fact of the matter is, he is the Minister of Transportation for the province of Ontario this week. We want him to do everything he can to encourage people to use public transit. He could come forward with some recommendations that would get people out of their cars and on to public transit—GO trains, Toronto transit, Markham transit, Richmond Hill transit, I do not care.

What is the minister doing, in spite of the fact that he has come out with some recommendations that are going to build some more things? What is he doing right now to get people out of their cars and on to public transit? He has to do more than he is doing; he has to encourage them. Let's hear today what it is.

The Speaker: Thank you. Do not give the solution after you have asked the question; just ask the question.

Hon Mr Wrye: The honourable member will be pleased to know that I am going to be seeing the federal Minister of Transport this Friday and I will certainly pass on his views to Mr Lewis in regard to support for Via Rail and for those who use Via Rail, or what little part is left of it once the Tories got through with it.

I know my friend will understand that whatever conversations I have with the Treasurer and whatever discussions we have in cabinet in terms of public transportation in an area that would affect the Treasurer would be done so privately. If I wished to bring forward to the Treasurer's attention the very useful suggestion from my friend the member for Markham, I

would do so in the privacy of cabinet, and the Treasurer will take whatever action he deems appropriate.

FEMALE OFFENDERS

Mrs LeBourdais: My question is for the Minister of Correctional Services. As a Metropolitan Toronto member, I was delighted with his announcement today and I am just wondering if he can expand on the need for female offenders' beds in addition to those which he has provided for male offenders.

Hon Mr Patten: I appreciate the question from the member for Etobicoke West. It is a question that often is asked in terms of the breakdown between males and females in our institutions and in corrections. I think she will be pleased to know that only 8.4% of admissions to our system are females, and indeed only 6% in terms of remands. The announcement I made today was really related to the pressures we have on the adult male remand population in the general area.

We have special services and institutions for females throughout Ontario. In this particular region, the Vanier Centre for Women, which has 96 beds, has a 24-bed treatment unit which is very highly regarded. There are other services that we offer, for example, at Metropolitan Toronto West Detention Centre, where we have 120 beds for females. At the Northern Treatment Centre in Sault Ste Marie, where we had the opening of that facility on Monday, we also have a section for treatment of female offenders.

Mrs LeBourdais: In addition to the housing announcement, could the minister elaborate on the kinds of programs that he has available specifically geared to female offenders?

Hon Mr Patten: I would be delighted to respond by saying, first of all, that likewise for males who are offenders in our system and sentenced, 87% are in community programs. It is also true that, by and large, the vast majority of female offenders are in community programs as well. They are involved in such things as skill development, assertiveness training, budgeting, general counselling and a whole variety of areas that have to do with life skills and skill development.

We have a number of private agencies that help us out. The Elizabeth Fry Society, the Salvation Army and others provide services to our female offenders and do a great job. I would also point out that we have a number of residences that are especially for native women, some to do with addiction or with alcohol difficulties.

ONTARIO ECONOMY

Mr Laughren: I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. The minister will know, or at least he should know, that in the speech from the throne of 1987 it was announced that the industrial restructuring commissioner was to be established to assist workers in industries facing major layoffs and plant closures, to help explore creative solutions to save jobs and to identify the restructuring and modernization requirements of industry.

Since that time there have been no annual reports produced. We understand that there is a report in the works for the food processing industry and another for the forestry industry, but nothing has been laid before this assembly or anybody else, as far as I can tell. Could the minister please tell me what in the world Malcolm Rowan is doing?

Hon Mr Kwinter: Malcolm Rowan is in fact the industrial restructuring commissioner. He has been working very diligent-

ly with both those two sectors that have been identified. He has met with them on many occasions. He has done interim reports, and his responsibilities are ongoing.

Mr Laughren: The commissioner has spent about \$3 million since his office was established and there are no visible signs of its having done anything. Since it was established, there have been about 30,000 Ontario workers who have been laid off, including 2,000 workers at Rio Algom and Denison Mines who will be in the streets of Elliot Lake. Dofasco closed its mines down in Kirkland Lake and Temagami, losing 700 jobs. Thirteen plants have been closed in Windsor-Essex since December 1989. Could the minister tell us why it is that with all these layoffs going on, the industrial restructuring commissioner seems to have done absolutely nothing? When is the minister going to lay before this assembly something that commissioner has done?

Hon Mr Kwinter: I think the member is really confusing two separate issues. There is no question that there are problems with adjustment as a result of free trade, as a result of the global economy, as a result of high interest rates. The industrial restructuring commissioner is not the panacea for all those things.

1510

Mr Laughren: I didn't ask that.

Hon Mr Kwinter: The member did. He listed all of the things that he was critical of and said, "How come the industrial restructuring commissioner has done nothing about it?" I am saying that the industrial restructuring commissioner is looking at the present time at two major industrial sectors. One of them is the forestry industry and the other one is the food processing industry. He has been meeting on a regular basis, he has been doing studies, he has been meeting with the industry and his goal and his mandate is to look at its long-term viability. He is not there to deal with the day-to-day problems of plants that are closing down as a result of external pressures.

Hon Mr Scott: We have had some private reports from Robin Sears you might like to hear about.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Scott: No, we haven't released them yet.

The Speaker: Order.

CASE OF TIMOTHY GARLAND

Mr Sterling: Since the Attorney General wants to answer other questions I will ask him a question himself. Timothy Garland is frightening many people in the Ottawa-Carleton area because he is going to be released in a month from now. He is paedophile who stalks young girls and brags about his potential for sexual violence, and there is no psychiatric hospital which is willing to treat his disorder.

Would the Attorney General have one of his staff, one of the crown attorneys, bring an application before the court to declare Garland a dangerous offender and therefore put him away where he deserves to be?

Hon Mr Scott: As the honourable member knows, the dangerous offender section of the Criminal Code to which he has referred requires that such an application be made before the conclusion of a trial of an offence, which is seen to be the last example of the dangerous offender's demonstrated difficulties. As the senior judge in Ottawa illustrated when he expressed his opinion in this case, it would not therefore be

possible under the Criminal Code to charge this young man with being a dangerous offender until he is charged again with a criminal offence.

That is not the honourable member's fault; that is not my fault; that is the provision of the Criminal Code, and I will not be able to respond, therefore, in the way the honourable member suggests. He may want to take the matter up, however, with the Honourable Kim Campbell, who is the Attorney General of Canada and has charge of the provisions of the Criminal Code.

Mr Sterling: There are other problems, of course, associated with this particular individual. His lawyer claims that no psychiatric hospital will offer him assistance. The Royal Ottawa Health Care Group insists that he does not want treatment.

Can the Attorney General assure my constituents and the people of Ottawa-Carleton that the police will keep a full-time surveillance on this individual to ensure that he will not again abuse young children, that we will not need another significant crime in order to put away this person who has a permanent disorder, a permanent illness that cannot be cured and can only be treated but he seems to refuse treatment, and that there will be a full-time police surveillance on this individual from the minute he walks out of jail?

Hon Mr Scott: The honourable member knows that neither this minister nor the government controls or has any supervision with respect to the police in the Ottawa-Carleton area at all. His request had better be directed to the board of commissioners of police of the Ottawa district. I am quite certain that they will give it the most earnest and serious consideration.

LAYOFFS

Mr Hampton: My question is for the Minister of Labour. About a month ago I asked the Minister of Labour to look into the situation surrounding the layoff of employees at Hogarth Westmount Hospital. He will remember that a number of those employees had made an equal pay application under the Employment Standards Act and that while that application was being investigated by his staff, the hospital announced that it was going to lay off all of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned.

The minister's assistant told me that the minister's staff has looked into the situation and does not regard Hogarth Westmount Hospital as being in contravention of the act. I want to ask the minister whether his staff has gone into the hospital and looked at the hospital records to determine through those records if the hospital is trying to contravene the act and, if he has not done so, why he has not. It seems to me that is the only way that he can guarantee some element of justice to these employees.

Hon Mr Phillips: The member did raise the question with me several weeks ago and we did look into it. I have been assured through the work of our staff that the individuals concerned were entitled to payment and that the payment has been made. However, I have been told as well that it had been the plan of the institution for some considerable period of time before the applications were made to change the job structures in that organization.

So there are two things: First, the individuals were, as a result of their application, granted additional pay; second, based on our investigation, the employer had planned these changes well before any of the demands were made in terms of provisions under the Employment Standards Act.

I am satisfied that the institution has complied with the intent of the act.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Ms Oddie Munro from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr67, An Act to revive the Harewood Park Association;
Bill Pr76, An Act to revive Jabko Holdings Ltd.

Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ONTARIO LOTTERY CORPORATION AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act.

Mrs Cunningham: Mr Speaker, you were not here yesterday to hear my remarks so I will just revamp where I was at and continue on with the new, just in case you missed those profound words.

We were talking yesterday about Bill 114 and I began by saying that indeed this is an act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, and some time last fall we looked at another piece of legislation, Bill 119, that was presented by the government for the very same reasons.

At that time, in the fall of last year, there was a great deal of public reaction to that piece of legislation. Some of the remarks of the public before the committee reiterated our belief that almost 100% of the citizens of Ontario who appeared before that committee on behalf of groups that represented physical fitness, sports, recreation and cultural activities, along with the Ontario Trillium Foundation, were almost unanimously opposed to any changes in the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act that would include a further diffusion of the funds collected in lotteries or through the sale of lotteries in Ontario to health or anything else. They thought that both health and now the protection of the environment were much too important to rely in any way on funding from the sale of lottery tickets.

But, more important, as we go back to the very beginning, we know that when people purchase those tickets and when there was a great debate around whether in Ontario we would be supporting lotteries at all, the legislation was accepted in this House and ultimately by the people of Ontario. The many volunteer groups, the many non-profit agencies, the many community and municipal groups that focused on recreation and sport, on cultural activities, on dance, on support groups who established boards and institutions in their own municipalities, such as art galleries, library boards, recreation departments, all of these volunteers did somewhat reluctantly go along with the legislation as long as the money was not to be spent on operating dollars and as long as it was to be spent in support of activities for culture, recreation, sport, that would encourage

good health and good recreation, certainly environmental activities at that point in time.

1520

Thus we said in September and October this year, as did the presenters before the committee, that there was really no need to take away from these particular groups to give money to both health and now the protection of the environment by using funds that were earmarked for other activities.

Yesterday, the chairman of the committee at that time stated in this House that there was a great deal of support for Bill 119, and I stated that indeed there was not and that we could not expect the same groups that had come out against Bill 119 to now come and show the same kind of lack of support for Bill 114 because in fact the principle is somewhat the same.

If we take a look at the commentaries and the headlines at that time, I believe if this bill were to go out for public hearing we would see the same kind of headlines: "Plan for Lottery Funds Causing Concern," "Englehart Council Opposes Change to Way Lottery Profits Are Spent," "City Council Makes Pitch for Hospitals Lottery."

At the same time as we took a look at the St Catharines city council, they were very much against any changes or any amounts of money that had normally gone to sports and recreation and cultural activities. What they were saying is that there ought to be a specific amount of money earmarked for those activities. At that time our party put forth an amendment to the bill and, of course, the majority government members on the committee opposed it.

The city of Windsor joined the list of Ontario cities opposing the transfer of an estimated \$350 million in accumulated lottery profits to reduce hospital deficits. City council approved a Toronto resolution against a proposed change in legislation that would allow provincial lottery money to be used for hospitals.

Today as we stand in this House, the government would not begin to send this bill out for public hearings because probably no one would come before the committee, not because they support the legislation but because they have given up on this government with regard to its ability to listen.

I would like to read into the record one of the other concerns that certainly the Progressive Conservative caucus has. It has to do with one that was raised at the time, that is, the attitude of the government that the public should believe that there will be dollars spent, possibly more dollars spent, on the protection of the environment because the government will now, because of this legislation, have the right or the opportunity to spend lottery dollars on the protection of the environment.

I would ask the government this question: Does this mean new money for the protection of the environment? The answer to that question is "Probably not." We do not know. There is nothing in the bill that states that any money will be spent. As a matter of fact, if one looks closely at the legislation, it says that it "may" be directed. If some lottery money is spent on the protection of the environment, does this now mean that any more money, more new money, will be spent on what I think is one of the greatest priorities in the world today, protecting our environment? No.

But of course if the government of Ontario feels that with this new way of promoting itself the public will think for one minute that this is a great government, with a great track record on protecting the environment, that is not true. This bill is just another little way of hiding the truth. It is called smoke and

mirrors. As you buy your lottery tickets, you can be assured that this does not mean that any money will be spent on protecting the environment. More important, you can be assured that it certainly does not mean that any new money will be spent at all. We just do not know that.

I think it would have been much better if the government had taken the advice of many of the citizens and the groups that appeared before that committee and had specifically designated a proportion of the money to go towards sports and recreation. At the same time, they would have had the opportunity to designate a certain proportion of the money to go towards health care, since they insisted on it, although others did not agree to it. At this point in time, they could have come forth and specifically designated a portion of the money to go towards the protection of the environment.

They obviously have the majority here; they are not listening to the public. They would not pretend to send the bill out because the public would not come. They all know that now and have given up. The time is much too valuable spent out there working with young people in recreation and sports, in preventive health care, in cultural activities and art galleries. Why would those same citizens who were so ill received by members of the Liberal government on the committee come again just to be insulted once more?

I think, more important, we should be taking a look at the dedication of these Ontario lottery dollars. We would call it pseudo-dedication—these are taxes—smoke and mirrors in Liberal fiscal policy, which is of course a fiscal policy that is mismanaged. This is just another example of Liberal government mismanagement.

Mr Neumann: You talk about mismanagement. Look at Ottawa.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please, the member for Brantford.

Mrs Cunningham: Before the member for Brantford gets too excited, I think he should sit back and just listen for a little while.

Mr Neumann: This government is well managed.

Mrs Cunningham: The member for Brantford likes to tell me to be specific, so I will be specific: the tire tax, fishing licences, Bill 119 and Bill 114, which will also, of course, amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. The gas guzzler tax and the employer health tax are a mixed bag, but all have one thing in common. Very carefully we should underline that this is what they have in common. This is it. They are all examples of how the Liberals use the implied dedication of revenues to justify tax grabs and other unpopular policy decisions. This lottery tax is a tax grab with the view that some of the money will be spent on protecting the environment. I have to tell you, Mr Speaker, we have no idea whether the Liberals will be spending any money, any of those dollars, on the environment.

Hon Mr Black: You are not making sense. There is no tax involved here. That is a ridiculous statement.

Mr Neumann: That is absolutely not true and you know it. The Treasurer gave his commitment.

Mrs Cunningham: Environment and health care have emerged—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There are a lot of uncalled-for interjections. If members want to avail themselves of comments, they all know that they will have a chance after the member's speech in the two-minute period, not during.

Mrs Cunningham: The government published a summary of recommendations. It was in response to the recommendations made by participants in the public hearings around An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. This document was prepared for the standing committee on general government as a result of about 190 oral and written briefs submitted to the committee. If we take a look at the responses and the basic recommendations that went before that committee: "Ongoing profits should continue to be used for capital projects and other specific non-recurring purposes."

Mr McLean: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I cannot believe what I see in this House this week. The disrespect for this place is unbelievable. Many days there have been six, seven or eight Liberal members in this Legislature.

The Deputy Speaker: I presume you are asking for a quorum call.

Mr McLean: I am asking for a quorum call.

Mr Neumann: Many times there was only one in your caucus here, sometimes none.

Mr McLean: You are to keep the quorum, not us, and you know it.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Will the Clerk please count.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1532

The Deputy Speaker: A quorum is now present. The member for London North may resume.

Mrs Cunningham: I was speaking to a member of the Liberal government there, and what we were talking about his colleagues would be most interested in. We will share it afterwards; we will continue on.

I will get on with the speech and I will expect the government members to listen, because these are comments that were made by the public before a committee of this Legislature, and if in fact members of the public even gave a hoot about what this government does any more, they would be down here speaking to Bill 114. But we could not even ask them. The opposition parties would not begin to ask them to come and speak to this bill, because it is a waste of their time. The committee system just is not working. This committee system is not working.

"Ongoing profits should continue to be used for capital projects and other specific non-recurring purposes." This was the Ontario Municipal Recreation Association, the Ontario Crafts Council and the Ontario Museum Association. It is such a list that I will just say "and others." This is the government's own document.

"The percentage of the profits for each sector should be prescribed in the legislation. For example, 50% should be designated for culture and 50% for recreation, sports and fitness." This is the Kingston Regional Arts Council, Dance Ontario, and the list goes on so long that the government's own researchers say "and others."

Just think about what was stated before the committee that took a look at the previous attempt by this government to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. The fitness and amateur sport citizens out there, all people who are interested in good health care, who are interested in the protection of the environment, all of their activities in support of health and the environment and fitness and recreation and sport, came before the committee and said: "You don't have to change this lottery

corporation act to promote good health care and to promote recreation to promote environmental protection. Just spend the money that was meant to go towards these activities with volunteers out there doing the work. It is the most efficient way of doing it." In some respects, it was meant to be just for that.

If the government is going to rely on lotteries to fund environment and health care, it ought to take a look at its own mismanagement practices, because in fact that is just what it is.

At the same time, the public came before the committee and said, "The accumulated profits of the dedicated Ontario lotteries should be treated as a trust fund and the interest thereon should be allocated annually for the support of culture, recreation, sports and fitness." This was the Alliance to Protect Culture, Recreation, Sports and Fitness in Ontario. Again, the government's own researchers say "and others," because the list goes on.

Then they go on to say, "The interest should be split equally between the culture and recreation sectors and allocated for specific priority projects." This is the Ontario Municipal Recreation Association from the city of Mississauga. "Interest payments should be used to supplement operating grants and subsidies"—Ontario Crafts Council, Toronto Arts Council and others. And on and on.

All of the recommendations that came before that committee were most worth while, recommendations on behalf of members of the public who right now are working out there with young people. They are worried about having enough money for recreation, enough money for sport, cultural activities and facilities. Long, long lists of grants were read into the record of that committee by small community groups which are supporting people in prison, which are supporting senior citizens, which are supporting—and the minister should be most interested in this—tourism, which are supporting recreation right now.

When you have the Minister of Tourism and Recreation standing here to ask that even more money be allocated towards, I am sure, fitness, amateur sport and culture, surely he should be most concerned that first of all the lottery dollars go to where they were intended to begin with, and those are all the areas that he should be most concerned about. Why is it that he allowed his ministry to support this bill when in the past the last amendment was supported by the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics? I must say that the whole management of how things are done here at Queen's Park is in question anyway. When you see two amendments to the same act presented by different ministers, you just wonder what the rationale is; you really do.

At the same time, I am just going to continue on here and read into the record that the Metropolitan Toronto library board said: "Bill 119 should be withdrawn"—that was the other amendment—"and the allocation of provincial lottery profits to grant programs increased to utilize the full amount of the annual profits and at least some of the accumulated reserve." What the library board in Metropolitan Toronto and other library boards were saying was, "We don't have enough money for the projects now."

Many of the projects which volunteers are supporting right across Ontario right now, environmental programs and health care programs that are sponsored by library boards, by art galleries—all programs that encourage young people—by fitness and recreation groups, all of them right now are saying, "We need more money and we think if the public has been willing in the past to dedicate its own dollars through the sale of lottery

tickets, you ought to put them exactly where they were meant to go."

All I can say right now is that this is just another example of the Liberal government looking for another way to tell the public how wonderful it is, how great it has been when it comes to the provision of health care. We all know that is not true. The waiting lists are longer than ever; 20% of people in hospital beds today should not be there. They should be in extended care facilities or in their own homes with community support care. Everybody wants to stay home as long as possible when they are ill.

If the government really wants to get money for health care, it should take a look at the way it is managing its own health care budget now. Twenty per cent of the people who are in hospitals today, in \$600- to \$800-a-day beds, should not be there. They could be in their own homes with community care givers, with front-line workers, with \$50 a day supporting them. For anybody who is listening to this debate today, it is not more money we need in health care; it is a better-managed health care system.

To take a look at lotteries for health care in September and October of last year and now come to the public and say, "We're going to spend money on the protection of the environment with your lottery dollars," is just a copout, because prevention in health care and support of the environment could have already been supported without any changes to the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. The government could have done those two things with the bill just the way it was. It chose not to do it because it wants to waste the time of the public to come down before the public hearings. Quite frankly, it wants to mislead them in many ways, because there is no way that this bill and its recommendations say that any money has to go into health care or any money has to go into the environment. It is just another way of wasting the Legislature's time.

1540

I am going to close now by saying that I have been most disappointed in the process. Our party is not interested in asking the public to come down here any more to speak to this piece of legislation because, as far as I am concerned, the government members on the committee have always been told what to do and the implications of Bill 119 are exactly the same as the implementation of Bill 114.

This is what the discussions produced as the Ontario Arenas Association travelled across the province of Ontario. With less money being spent—

Mr Campbell: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: Could the Speaker remind us of the meaning of the word "mislead" in the context that the member has been using it and perhaps admonish her not to use those terms and to withdraw the term, please?

Mrs Cunningham: I did not think I said anything that was unparliamentary.

The Deputy Speaker: I was not—

Mrs Cunningham: I really did not, Mr Speaker; I do not think I was a bit unparliamentary.

The Deputy Speaker: Well, can I ask the member to make sure that she will not be unparliamentary and beyond—

Mrs Cunningham: I have not been unparliamentary so far since I have been here. I tell certain individuals in this House they can kiss their seats goodbye in the next election, but I do not even think that is unparliamentary.

The Deputy Speaker: Please proceed.

Mrs Cunningham: Mr Speaker, I am speaking to you. It is very difficult some days, but we will try our hardest.

The group that travelled the province to talk about The Future, Yours to Determine on 5 October 1989, the Ontario Arenas Association, was looking for input right across the province as to what effects it may in fact be looking at if the money that went into the lottery funds was not put into recreation and sport. This is what they told the committee.

They said that if they did not get additional dollars via the Ontario Lottery Corp, more closures of arenas or facilities might indeed take place. They said that increased taxes would occur, alienating potential low-income users. That meant in fact that the municipalities were going to have to raise more money to provide communities with arenas and with improvements to arenas and more recreational facilities. The money would have to be raised by municipalities. They said that if there was going to be a lessening of support, there would be a displacement of people actively using facilities. That is too bad, because we are talking about health care and prevention and we are talking about an aging society. These lottery dollars should have gone to support those recreational facilities.

We are talking about unemployment of youth. Many of these groups appeared before government agencies, before the Ontario Lottery Corp, to ask, through grants, to employ young people on summer jobs, to employ people in part-time work. I think probably the most meaningful kind of employment that goes on is working in recreational activities, sports, the environment and health care. All of those things could have happened with the other bill. Now we are taking a look at unemployment of youth—

Hon Mr Black: What does your party know about the environment? Your party never did anything about the environment. You should be ashamed of yourself. How dare you talk about the environment?

Mrs Cunningham: These are not my words. These are the words of the public. We asked them to come before the committee.

If there is not more money spent on arenas, we will have unsafe facilities.

Hampered lifestyle: This was their sixth point—

Hon Mr Black: How can you do that with a straight face?

Mrs Cunningham: Mr Speaker, as you can see, the interjections on behalf of the Liberal members—that is exactly what they did in committee. They were not listening then. Therefore, the bill was passed. Therefore, the recreation groups, library boards, art galleries and people interested in dance and in helping others will remember the next time around. Many of these Liberals will have a very difficult time getting their seats back. They should be very careful about what they say.

Hampered lifestyle, no identifiable community core—what that really means is that there are many communities across this province right now that do not have facilities to begin with. They do not have the same kind of programs that municipalities with large tax bases have. More important, they do not have the same kind of facilities because it is so much more expensive to construct new arenas and new buildings than it was in the past. In fact, if the government takes the same amount of dollars and gives them out year by year and now gives them out also for health and protection of the environment, it is definitely taking away from the support for these people who are interested in Ontario arenas. I could have used any one of the briefs to show

the specific examples, because I have been told many times to be more specific.

I think the disintegration of the partnership between volunteers and professionals is the saddest thing of all because these were volunteer groups that were looking for these grants. As we talk daily in this House about staff training throughout the province, many of the grants that went to these volunteer groups were to encourage staff training either in the professional facilities or of volunteers. Members know that in these times we rely on volunteers more than ever to support the activities that are so important to our communities, young people, school systems, hospitals and environmental protection groups. We do that and we did that without ever amending the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, and yet we see another amendment.

I will conclude by saying that we know the public has not been listened to when it comes to the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. We struggled in the beginning, years ago, to get the public to buy into the sale of lottery tickets in Ontario. We used to look on those tickets and we knew when we bought a ticket for a hockey player, a swimmer or a hiker, that was where the money was going to go.

Right now I will close by saying to all of the public of Ontario, perhaps every dollar that you spend on lottery tickets under the Liberal government could in fact go into the consolidated revenue fund and never leave it. I will conclude my remarks on that point because this act, Bill 114, does not ensure that any money will be spent for the protection of the environment.

Mr Kerrio: I have just a brief comment or two. The member must obviously be aware that the people who would come to not support either Bill 119 or Bill 114 certainly would be people with a vested interest and naturally they would come to the committee to ask for continued support. I cannot believe that the people would not agree that when we take moneys from a lottery that keeps getting more money each year and develop such surplus funds, they should not go into hospitals and the environment, the two highest priorities the people of Ontario have struck as their concerns about this society of ours. With the threat of global warming and toxins in our waterways and such, I do believe that the majority of people would support the position of this government that, as we develop considerably more funds than we had first anticipated in the lotteries, we would make sure they go to very good causes, and I cannot think of two better causes than hospitals and the environment.

Mr Pouliot: Again, words of wisdom and a potpourri of what has happened to the lottery game, the purpose, the mandate, the intent and the spirit of revenues from the voluntary taxation through Wintario. The riding of Lake Nipigon exemplifies this, perhaps better than any, with its 114,000 square miles. We too from time to time, in terms of programming and infrastructure, were dependent for the purpose of recreation on the funds from Wintario. The lottery was originally designed to give the less fortunate a chance to be like the others.

This minister, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, Blackjack Black, has turned the environment—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Standing orders call for referring to members by the name of their ridings or their portfolios, not anything else.

1550

Mr Pouliot: I will withdraw the term "Blackjack Black." A game of chance, a minister who favours Crowns and Anchors when we are talking about the subject matter of the environ-

ment, a game of luck, a casino attitude: What is happening to your mandate, Minister?

The Deputy Speaker: Address the Speaker, please.

Mr Pouliot: Through you, Mr Speaker, what is happening to the minister? You started with Wintario.

The Deputy Speaker: Address the Speaker, please.

Mr Pouliot: When Wintario was in disfavour, you changed the rules and went to Lotto 649, which was an awful lot more lucrative, and you started—

The Deputy Speaker: Address the Speaker, please.

Mr Pouliot: —little by little to abandon your mandate. The small communities are reminding you, with high respect, Minister, again through you, Mr Speaker, that you shall be judged very harshly the next time around—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member's time is up. Thank you.

Mr McLean: I want to comment briefly on the member's remarks. I congratulate her on a lot of the points she has brought out.

The member for Niagara Falls pointed out very clearly with regard to the committee hearings—and I happen to be on that committee and I heard them and I knew the reason the people were coming. A lot of those people were not upset about money going into health care, but what they wanted to do was to keep their share of the money that they were used to getting.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr McLean: The indication was that the Treasurer said that he would give it, but do you know why they wanted it in writing? Do you remember back some time ago there was to be beer and wine in the corner stores? Do you remember that promise?

The Deputy Speaker: Address the Speaker, please.

Mr McLean: Do you remember the automobile insurance promise that was made?

The Deputy Speaker: Address the Speaker, please.

Mr McLean: Do you remember the housing, 100 new units? Do you remember the Sunday shopping, a common pause day was promised? Do you remember the free trade, that there would be no deal?

An hon member: Hospital beds.

Mr McLean: Do you remember the hospital beds and the commitment that was made to Orillia for \$30 million and 4,400 new beds? Where are they?

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr McLean: I can go on and talk about the only promise that was never made that was kept was all the increase in taxes. That was not a promise, that they would increase taxes, but they certainly did.

Education: Do you remember the promise they made to increase it to 60% funding? Whatever happened to that?

That is why those people came before that committee. They wanted a commitment in writing that they would still get the funds they have got over the period of terms of years, and they have not got that funding—

Mr Kerrio: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would suggest that he is supposed to be responding to the speaker and not—are you not going to call him to order on that? No? Well.

Mr McLean: I want to tell you, Mr Speaker, there is nobody who does not want a special lottery for environment and a special lottery for health care, but to amend the lottery bill to put it into the general consolidated revenue fund is not appropriate. They want a precise, separate lottery, and that is not happening.

Mr Sola: I wish that the member from London would let the critic of her party know the fact that she considers that it is not necessary to have more money allocated for health, because on a daily basis he gets up and keeps lambasting the minister for additional funds for all sorts of purposes. She says that there should be a different direction in health care, and then that same member of her party gets up in this House and lambastes the minister for going to community health centres and advocating that.

Mr Fleet: The leader doesn't listen to her either.

Mr Sola: Speaking of her leader, he ran for the leadership of the party on a platform of balancing the budget. For the leader of a party to run on that is ludicrous when you consider the fact that this government has balanced the budget for the last two years. In other words, his policy is a fait accompli of this government. In other words, he is proving that his party is history, because we have been doing for the past two years what he promises to do in the future.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that based on Bill 114?

Mr Sola: As for the charge of mismanagement of the economy by our government, she speaks for a party that left the province with a \$2.6-billion deficit the last year it was in power and this government has been balancing the budget for the last two years, so if anybody has been a proper manager, if anybody has shown capability in management of the economy, it has been the Treasurer of this province and the Liberal government of Ontario. For the third party to question that is ludicrous when you look at the record.

The Deputy Speaker: Will the member for London North please respond?

Mrs Marland: No more?

The Deputy Speaker: Eight minutes have gone by. The member for London North.

Mrs Marland: Oh, I guess I will have to wait until I get to speak, then.

Mrs Cunningham: First of all, to the member for Niagara Falls, whom I enjoy immensely, I think that he has missed the point.

"When we talk about surplus, who determines what surplus?" This is from Sport Ontario. "The problem, of course, is, who determines what is surplus? Over the past several years, the provincial government has refused to allocate in excess of \$369 million of lottery profits."

They have not even given it out. Our government was part of it, but so were they, and they were for the last five years. They do not even give it out.

"The government, without regard for the rising costs facing the sport community, withheld funds for legitimate programs and projects."

This government would not even put into the bill that it would designate any money for sport and recreation. The

Treasurer said—and we are supposed to believe the Liberals? Huh. With all their promises, we do not believe them. In 1986-87, the grants made were about \$120 million. That is all they are prepared to give. In the next few years—

Interjection.

Mrs Cunningham: Yes, it is. The Treasurer said \$120 million for the next three years. They will not even designate the money for sport, recreation and culture. They do not have to spend anything on it. It says "may."

With regard to my colleague from Mississauga East, in no way do we ever stand up here and say more money should be spent, we say money should be spent efficiently—

Interjections.

Mrs Cunningham: I am so sorry.

Money should be spent more efficiently on projects that matter. In fact, if they took a look at the 20% of people in hospital beds who should not be there, they would be saving money and they could build more hospitals. It is a matter of good management. So I am not going to stand here and say that this has been the position of our Health critic. It has not, and I will put it on the record, it is not the position of our party.

Mr Hampton: I am pleased to take part in this rather robust debate, because my part of the province gets to witness, probably more often than most, Liberal promises and then failure of Liberal promises, so I will no doubt mention many of those promises in my little diatribe as well.

Let me start out by saying that we are opposed to this legislation because, from our perspective, this is purely a public relations gesture. What I mean by that is simply this: If you read through the legislation, you will see that there is absolutely no provision for the Ministry of the Environment to consult regarding the rational allocation of the dollars that are involved in this bill. There is no provision in the bill whatsoever. In fact, the discretion as to how this funding is spent is almost strictly in the hands of the Treasurer.

Now, we all know what the Treasurer knows about the environment. It is well reputed that he is the person in cabinet who tells the Minister of the Environment to "quiet down there, boy, don't raise too many environmental issues."

So what a paradox: The funds from this so-called environmental lottery are essentially in the hands of the minister who has the least interest in environmental issues.

Mr Neumann: All the ministers are interested in the environment.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, the member for Brantford, please.

Mrs Cunningham: Throw him out, Mr Speaker. He did it all day yesterday too.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for London North also.

Mr Hampton: I find that Liberal members are always willing to talk from the side but never willing to stand up in this House and defend their position. I think the member for Brantford is exhibiting that quite adequately right now.

So here we have this paradox. The people of Ontario are supposed to believe this lottery is for the purposes of defending the environment, yet the funds that go from it are going to be under the control of the Treasurer—a paradox indeed.

1600

But it is purely a public relations gesture for more reasons than that. There is no statement in this bill as to the specific dedication of the funds. It would be a lot better if this legislation said in it perchance that the funds of the lottery "shall be allotted" to a special set of environmental projects. We might have a little easier time believing this if it said that, but it does not even say that.

What I can see from this legislation is essentially a lot of little jingles and ads on the television and the radio just before election time talking about this lottery and advertising this lottery. That is what I can see this being used to pay for. What I can envision is essentially a little slush fund that will allow the Liberal regime to raise the government's public profile on the problem without doing anything about the problem. That is what I see here. That is what I really see involved, because let's face it, the whole field of lotteries in Ontario has grown to such an extent that it is saturated. There have been all kinds of studies of legalized gambling done in Canada and outside Canada which illustrate time and time again that there is a saturation point in the lottery business, that one can only promote legalized gambling so far, that the market is only so large. We have probably reached that point and gone beyond it in Ontario.

This is not going to be a great revenue-maker for the government, it is not going to be a great revenue-maker for the environment, it is going to be a great public relations campaign and that is about it.

We oppose this as well for another reason. When I read the Brundtland report, when I read other, shall we say, serious papers that address the issue of the environment, they talk about the central concept of making the polluter pay, that if we want to have a rational environmental policy, there has to be some connection between those who pollute and those who pay and the money and how it is used for providing environment cleanup has to be there. This detracts from, if it is does not destroy, that concept. That is what is happening here.

It does not surprise me. I wanted to ask the Minister of the Environment a question today on the environment, but he did not show up. We have had very serious problems with kraft mill pollution across the northern part of this province. It has been known since at least 1985 that kraft mills pump all kinds of dioxins and furans into the environment. What has the Minister of the Environment done about it? He has consulted with the industry and talked to them a little bit. We have had six years now. The pulp and paper companies are making lots of money. They are very happy. Their mills are making \$9 million and \$10 million a month while they pump more dioxins and more furans into the rivers, lakes and drinking water of the province. Again, what has the Minister of the Environment done about it? He has consulted; that is it.

What is going on here is a charade. What is needed is environmental policy which gets tough with polluters, not something which seeks to wishy-wash the whole situation.

Nowhere is the record of this Minister of the Environment worse and more seriously bad than in the area of corporate polluters. Nowhere is it more serious than that.

Mr Neumann: You know that's not the case.

Hon Mr Black: That's absolute nonsense.

Mr Hampton: Read the opinion polls.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Just the speaker, please.

Mr Hampton: Here we have a public relations scheme that is going to do very little in terms of raising meaningful funding for the environment, but at the same time—

Mr Neumann: How do you know that? You have no faith in the people.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Brantford, please.

Mr Hampton: As I said, the member for Brantford is very good at speaking when no one wants to hear from him, but when he has a chance to speak he sits down.

Mr Kerrio: I want to hear from him.

Mr Hampton: He had his opportunity to take part in this rotation and he missed it.

What has happened to the concept that the polluter should pay? What is happening to the concept the polluter should pay in Ontario is it is being diluted, just as this government's environmental policy seems to amount to diluting the pollution that is there without really doing anything about it.

There is another reason why this legislation should be defeated. Again, studies of legalized gambling and studies of lotteries have shown time and time again that the people who pay for lotteries are by and large those people who are at the lower end of the economic profile in our province. By and large, the advertising that this province does for its lotteries, the ads which appear on the radios, on the televisions and in the newspapers of this province, are aimed at that audience, trying to get them to buy lottery tickets. All the studies indicate that is exactly where this province aims its advertising and that is exactly where it goes after its market.

In other words, its deliberate policy in terms of lotteries is to tax those people who can least afford to be taxed, only this time, instead of doing it through the front door, they are really going to do it by the back door. This way, they engage all sorts of lucrative advertising to convince people that it is in their interest to spend their money on these kinds of lotteries. They use all kinds of lucrative advertising trying to tell people: "Here's your pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Spend another \$10 this week and you might be the big winner."

That is a very sad policy indeed. That is the saddest of policies. I think it indicates a government that is completely bankrupt in terms of its policy approach on issues of taxation and issues of funding important programs.

So here we have another lottery which is designed to milk money out of those people in Ontario who can probably least afford to be taxed.

Mr Neumann: You have no faith in the people. Let them choose.

Mr Hampton: I have faith in a lot of people; I have no faith in this government. This bill illustrates exactly why we are losing faith in this government, a bill that is designed to milk more money out of the people of the province who have the least ability to pay taxes.

What are those taxes going to be used for? A substitute for meaningful fines and meaningful attempts to get the polluter to pay.

In the final analysis, all that is going to come of this is more Liberal advertising just before the election, advertising the newest lottery for the newest sexy cause without doing anything at all of substance to deal with the problem.

There is a very serious problem out there, a very serious problem in terms of industrial pollution, a very serious problem in terms of too much packaging and a very serious problem in

terms of not using and reusing goods but, as the Minister of the Environment has allowed, allowing to come on to the market more and more goods that cannot be reused and that go to the dump.

In a nutshell, that is where we are in this bill. That is why we oppose this bill. That is why we oppose the whole concept that is involved here. Quite frankly, this bill indicates how bankrupt this government is, but at the same time what lengths it will go through to disguise its bankruptcy.

Mr Neumann: I would like to comment briefly on the speech of the member for Rainy River.

He commented on the fact that I, as a member, do not rise in my place and give speeches. I have spoken in this Legislature on many occasions on many important subjects representing my area, and also on subjects of importance to the province of Ontario.

It seems to me that in presenting a very negative point of view on the bill before us, the member is ignoring the fact that the people of Ontario, indeed the people of our whole country, are anxious to get involved in the environmental issue.

It seems to me that the people in the official opposition also lacked faith in the blue box program; they did not think it would work. It has worked. There has been a tremendous response from the people in Ontario to the United-Nations-award-winning blue box program.

I have ordinary citizens calling me up and visiting my constituency office supporting this particular kind of lottery in support of the environment. I think people will respond very positively to it. The funds will be used in a creative and energetic manner. I am just disappointed—not surprised, but disappointed—that we do not have a more imaginative and creative response from the official opposition. It is fine to be critical, it is fine to be opposing something, but what is the alternative? Come up with a positive alternative.

I hope the member is not suggesting that when the funds do come forward there will not be people in his riding coming up with creative proposals to take advantage of these funds.

Mr Hampton: In line with Liberal policy, I am sure that the paper mills and some of the greater polluters of the province would be only too happy to accept some of this money. I am sure that on the record of this government they would be only too happy to hand it out.

I do not think I need to again recite chapter and verse of all the things we have said about environmental policy in this province. We have said we believed in a superfund. We have said we believe that the executives of corporations who pollute should spend a little time in jail. They might realize then that the province is serious about environmental policy. None of those things has happened.

If this lottery fund is this government's excuse for an environmental superfund, I repeat my statement: it is bankrupt. If this is this province's excuse for an environmental superfund, that just shows how empty the think tanks over there are.

I just want to say in my remaining time that I think we need only look around this Legislature to see how seriously this government takes this legislation. The government just missed its speaking opportunity in this debate. The speaking order has passed from the Conservatives to our party and no Liberal got up to take part in this debate whatsoever. I think that indicates—

Mr Kerrio: On a point of order, Mr Speaker; I spoke to this issue last night. What is the member talking about?

An hon member: You were not here.

Mr Hampton: We were not sitting last night, so the member does not know; late afternoon. So he does not even know and he is making comments, and that is not appropriate.

For the member for Niagara Falls, let me point out that there is a difference between last night and yesterday afternoon. This House sits in the afternoon and not at night, just to help his confusion. But to help his confusion again, let me remind him that again the rotation has moved and no Liberal has taken part.

Finally I want to point out that once again on an important issue the Liberal government cannot keep a quorum in this House for a very important policy issue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz) ordered the bells rung.

1614

Mrs Marland: As I rise to speak to the second reading of Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, I certainly appreciate the applause from the member for Brantford and also my friend the member for Niagara Falls. It is really encouraging to rise to speak to a government bill and receive applause from the government members. However, I would be surprised if the government members did not realize that I am going to speak in opposition to this bill.

It is probably singularly significant that I am speaking in opposition to this bill because I am the spokesperson for the environment for our caucus, as is well known in this House. But it is because I am the spokesperson for the environment that I have a very genuine concern about this bill and what it purports to do for the environment. For that reason, I want to read the explanatory note of the bill.

It simply says: "Section 9 of the act now provides that the net profits of the Ontario Lottery Corp are available to be appropriated by the Legislature for the promotion and development of physical fitness, sports, recreational and cultural activities and facilities therefor, as well as for the activities of the Ontario Trillium Foundation. The bill amends section 9 to provide that the net profits of the Ontario Lottery Corp are also available to be appropriated by the Legislature for the protection of the environment.

"The bill does not amend the existing scheme, set out in section 9 of the act, for dealing with net profits of the corporation that are not specifically appropriated by the Legislature. Under this scheme, any part of the net profits of the corporation in a fiscal year of Ontario that is not appropriated by the Legislature in the fiscal year for the abovementioned purposes is to be treated as part of the appropriation made by the Legislature in the fiscal year for the operation of hospitals."

I want to start by dealing with comments to this bill made this afternoon by the member for Mississauga East, who stood in this House and congratulated and lauded his government for balancing the budget. I think it has to be the most absurd statement the member for Mississauga East could make. Unfortunately, he lives in a municipality which has been sorely hurt by the taxation of this Liberal government in the past five years in Ontario.

The member for Mississauga East, in speaking in this House this afternoon, referred to the fact that his government has balanced the budget the last two years. He is doing that at the same time as he is receiving telephone calls and letters—unless his office is treated differently from mine, which is another Mississauga riding, but I know he has had meetings with the representatives of both school boards and he certainly must have received letters and telephone calls, as my office has—expressing tremendous concern about the funding for education through both the Dufferin-Peel Roman Catholic Separate

School Board and through the Peel Board of Education, and also from the hospitals.

The fact is that those of us who live in Mississauga have special privileges because we live in what is now designated by the Liberal government as an area called the greater Toronto area. Even though we are a city of 400,000 people we are now part of the greater Toronto area. For that privilege under this Liberal government we have different sets of rules and different prices for different privileges than do people who live outside that area. We have talked before in this House about the commercial concentration tax, which is a penalty for living in the greater Toronto area. We have talked about the increase which is now in effect for our motor vehicle licences and our drivers' licences. Yet, this member for Mississauga East stands up and says, "This government has balanced its budget." Anyone who pays property taxes in the city of Mississauga knows that this budget has been balanced on the backs of property—

Mr Neumann: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the member is not speaking to the subject matter before us. She has wandered considerably from the topic.

1620

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): We allow some latitude from time to time.

Mrs Marland: How is it that the honourable member for Brantford did not rise and correct the member for Mississauga East when he was talking about the same subjects which I am now addressing? So we obviously have a different set of rules. I would ask the member for Brantford at least to be fair among the colleagues in this House and allow me the same privilege of addressing the subject of balancing the budget as he allowed his own colleague to talk about balancing the budget.

I am not going to spend very much more time on it, simply to say, however, that the constituents of the member for Mississauga East are facing horrific property tax increases this year because the Liberal government has balanced its budget on the backs of property taxpayers throughout the municipalities in this province by a reduction in transfer payments to the school boards, by a reduction in subsidies to municipalities for hard services, by a reduction in transfer payments for the other obligations that are totally a provincial government responsibility but which are now put on the local municipalities. We may even talk about courtroom security and the added cost to the police budget in Peel, which I am sure the member for Mississauga East has had telephone calls on.

But if the member for Mississauga East chooses to defend the balancing of a provincial budget on the backs of his local property taxpayers in Mississauga, that may be his choice. It may also be his death as a member and a representative of that area, because people who understand what is going on in this province today have no doubt about what is going on. They know very clearly that we have a current Liberal government in Ontario that does not meet its obligations to those people in Ontario who expect provincial programs to be provincially funded.

All we have in Ontario today are provincial programs that are provincially mandated, but who pays for them but the local taxpayers? Even the small-business person who has to rent space in buildings that are bigger than 200 square feet now has to pay a commercial concentration tax. We have, of course, the tremendous cash cow for this Liberal government, the employer health tax. I feel sorry for any members in this House who have the audacity to stand up and congratulate their government for

balancing its budget when in fact all it has done is offload the cost.

Mr Fleet: Are you against having a balanced budget?

Mrs Marland: I would ask any members in this House who are presently interjecting, if they do not believe what I am saying and they think what I am saying is partisan, to read a very thorough, comprehensive report that was written by the Treasurer and commissioner of finance for the region of Peel. His name is Bob Richards. He is a highly competent, highly talented, brilliant young man, and he and his staff have written a report which covers pages of evidence about what has gone on in financing the region of Peel as it relates to senior levels of government.

I would ask the member for Mississauga East to take the time to read this report. Then he would understand very accurately what the term "offloading" means. It means offloading the responsibility for funding provincial programs on to the local municipalities. For this government to claim it has balanced the budget, as far as I am concerned, is a perfect example of a shell game. Yes, it may have balanced the budget, but only because it does not pay for anything any more; it makes the municipalities pay for it. We, as property owners or even if we do not own property, if we are renting, are paying the cost of provincial government today through our property taxes, and that is totally irresponsible. It is marginally misrepresenting what the true financial picture is in Ontario today when they say they have balanced the budget.

This Bill 114 is another example of where this government is setting its priorities. It is saying to the people of this province: "Yes, I suppose we should say something about the environment. We should get a bill out. We should get a bill tabled in the Legislature that proves we're responsible in terms of the environment."

I want to tell members how responsible this government is in terms of the environment. It is so responsible that it has taken from the Ministry of the Environment \$341 million this year—and for what? To set up another government agency. It has taken away this money to establish an agency to deal with water and sewers.

Hon Mr Black: Are you suggesting water and sewers have nothing to do with the environment?

Mrs Marland: Mr Speaker, I can hardly hear myself speak for the interjections. I would ask that you ask these members to adhere to the House rules.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member for Mississauga South has brought to my attention that there are numerous interjections. Of course, being the most patient of all members here possible—I like to think I am most patient—I have been neglectful of reminding all members that they should allow the honourable member for Mississauga South the quiet opportunity of making her discussions and concerns heard about the subject matter before the House.

Interjections.

Mrs Marland: There are even members in this House who are interjecting and I notice they are not even in their own seats. I suppose I should be flattered that there are at this point more members in this House than there were earlier this afternoon. It may be that they have been sent in to defend their government because finally they are hearing some home truths. I see that the government whip is sitting here. She has probably said: "We'd better get in there. We'd better get Marland. We had better

drown her out, because what she's telling the people of Ontario is the truth."

That is probably a great deal of concern for this government because the people of Ontario are learning the truth about Liberal government and what it means very quickly.

Mrs E. J. Smith: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I just want to assure the member that I am not out to get the poor soul at all.

The Acting Speaker: I can only bring to the attention of the member for Mississauga South, as she is quickly counting whether there is a quorum or not, that she sometimes does not help herself by being so provocative. If you were less provocative, maybe you would not have the difficulty you are having.

Mrs Marland: I apologize if my remarks are being interpreted as being provocative, but I must say I am complimented that at the moment we have something like 14 Liberal members in the House. Barely more than an hour ago we had seven. At one point this afternoon we had six Liberal members. That has to indicate that the Liberal government members do not think any more highly of Bill 114 than do I.

The Acting Speaker: Was that a quorum call?

Mrs Marland: Yes, I think it is, Mr Speaker.

Mr Grandmaitre: There is only one Tory in the House.

Mrs Marland: That is fine, but she is worth about 10 others.

1630

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is present, Mr Speaker.

Mrs Marland: The attendance in this House is increasing by the moment, and that is really encouraging. I just hope that the members will serve me the same courtesy that I serve them—we now have another minister in the House also—where they would not interrupt and make interjections. I do not interject when they are speaking; I wait until the two-minute opportunity.

Hon Mr Elston: Oh Margaret, your nose is growing.

Mrs Marland: Any member of this House, if he can control himself, can wait until I have finished and use the two-minute rebuttal time, and I welcome that input, as a matter of fact.

To get back to Bill 114, the purpose of the bill, on the surface, is for this Liberal government to say, "We want to do something about protecting the environment." But the priority of this Liberal government, as I was saying, in terms of protecting the environment is to remove \$341 million from the ministry, establish this water and sewer government agency, an arm's-length agency similar to Ontario Hydro, and I think even that in itself would have to tell us how removed from the government this agency will be.

If the \$341 million was needed to establish this separate government corporation to deal with water and sewers, then that money should have been allocated by the Treasurer, not taken away from, as far as I am concerned, one of the most important ministries in this province today, the Ministry of the Environment.

What kind of priority does this government place on the Ministry of the Environment when it reduces that budget by \$341 million? What kind of priority do they place on the emplacement of sewer and water line systems across this

province when that is no longer going to be dealt with by the Ministry of the Environment? What can put the environment at more risk than water and sewage treatment? Yet we are now saying, according to the current government, we do not need to have it under the Ministry of the Environment any longer.

However, they probably have realized that, obviously, after their five years in government—

Mr Neumann: I thought she was the critic. You haven't studied the proposal.

Mrs Marland: Mr Speaker, the member for Brantford is being obnoxious. He has not stopped his prattle since he came in this afternoon. I wish he would get up and use his turn and speak. As the previous speaker for the New Democratic Party said, the government members are not speaking to this bill. If the member for Brantford wants to speak, he can get up and speak in rotation. He is not picking up that opportunity. The government members are not speaking in rotation. They are simply leaving this debate to the opposition parties, which, as I said, says a lot about the bill. In any case, I would appreciate it if the member for Brantford would stop his prattling and try to behave.

The priority of the environment for this government is well stated, and it is well stated by the fact that it has cut back the Ministry of the Environment's budget. Now, they are looking at all the things they have not done, and among those is a very long list. In that long list of things they have not done, most important—and I know, Mr Speaker, that you are very aware of this in your own riding—they have not managed or attempted to manage the garbage crisis in Ontario today. The longer they procrastinate in dealing with that issue, the more serious and the more severe it becomes.

I suppose there really is not a stronger word than "crisis." However, that is the word that describes today the fact that we have over 100 municipalities in Ontario which, within 12 months, will have nowhere to put their garbage. That is an environmental issue.

However, at the same time, we have a Ministry of the Environment being diminished. That is all you can say; if a ministry loses that kind of money out of its budget, that ministry is being diminished. You cannot cut a ministry budget by \$341 million and not accept that the budget is being diminished.

Also, we have a Ministry of the Environment which thinks it is fine to exempt landfill sites from the Environmental Assessment Act. Last August, the Premier made an announcement—and this is significant, that it was the Premier who made this announcement, not the Minister of the Environment—that all interim landfill sites would be exempt from the Environmental Assessment Act.

Under questioning, both in the standing committee on estimates and in this House, we have not been able, through my questions to the Minister of the Environment, to establish what is considered to be an interim site. We do not know whether an interim site has to be a maximum number of years or a minimum number of years. There is no definition today in Ontario of what an interim landfill site is. It could be 4 years, 6 years, 8 years, 10 years or 12 years; we can just pick it out of the hat. If a municipality has an interim site approved without a time limit on it and it is not even subjected to an environmental assessment under the Environmental Assessment Act, then that speaks louder than anything else about what this government's commitment is to protecting the environment.

How a landfill site can be approved without an environmental assessment is the question that hundreds of environmental

groups in this province are asking today. Unfortunately, that is another issue of concern for the people of Ontario as it pertains to the environment.

We have been waiting for a new air emissions standard, regulation 308, to be issued by the Ministry of the Environment. That has not come forth either. We have a tremendous void, unfortunately, from this Minister of the Environment. Every time in the last nine months that there has been a major announcement to do with the environment, including, I may add, the confirmation of my own resolution in this House to preserve the Rouge Valley—when I placed a motion in this House to preserve the Rouge Valley and tablelands as a park, which was, I am proud to say, unanimously supported by all parties in this House, I wondered how long it might take the government to act upon it. Of course, I was overjoyed when the Premier made that announcement at the Rouge Valley earlier this year.

What was significant is that I understand, although I was not there, that there were something like 12 cabinet ministers at that large announcement, and a number of the local members were there. Certainly, I know the member for Scarborough East was there.

When they made the announcement to preserve the Rouge Valley, what did they do? They went to the Rouge Valley and they set up a huge marquee. Anyone who has looked into the cost of renting marquees knows that they cost about \$8,000 to \$10,000 to rent. Here these Liberal cabinet ministers go to the Rouge Valley, which is being preserved so that everybody can enjoy the all outdoors, and what do they do?

Mr Faubert: It was supposed to rain that day.

Mrs Marland: They are worried that it might rain. Is it not somewhat ironic that here we have this magnificent piece of property which, I can tell members through personal experience, is beautiful in the rain, beautiful in the snow and beautiful in good weather.

Mr Faubert: How many times were you out there? Once?

Mrs Marland: I have been to that Rouge Valley property far more times, I would suggest, than the member who is interjecting, who is out of his seat.

1640

Mr Faubert: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mrs Marland: He cannot raise a point of order. I would have thought that by the time the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere had been in the House two and a half years, he would know the rules of order of this House. He does not even have the courtesy to be in his own seat to interject. He is interjecting out of his own seat and asking me how many times I have been to the Rouge Valley. I would like to tell him that when this government was deciding to protect the environment—

The Acting Speaker: I am just having such a difficult time this afternoon. I say to the member for Mississauga South, there is just something about your manner that is causing such disruption. However, I could mention to other members who are not in their seats and who are prattling on, as the member for Mississauga South has indicated, that we should all try to keep it to a minimum.

The member for London South has a point of order? The only one who is in her seat stands up and she does not have a point of order.

Mrs Marland: The reason, as I said earlier, that I am being interpreted as being provocative is that I am speaking the truth.

Some of these points are hitting home and people do not want to hear them.

I want to tell members that this Liberal government's commitment to the environment, which Bill 114 is supposed to reinforce, is a farce. I want to tell members, as I was saying before I was interrupted, that when they announced the preservation of the Rouge, they rented an \$8,000 or \$10,000 marquee and they all went out and huddled under the marquee. As they were huddling under the marquee with a number of local members and cabinet ministers, who was not there? Who was absent? I would like to tell members the person who was absent was the Minister of the Environment. The announcement was made by the Premier and by the Minister of Natural Resources, and somewhere, arriving late but not on the platform and under the marquee—

Mr Faubert: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The Minister of the Environment was there.

The Acting Speaker: That is absolutely not a point of order, but I am being gracious and allowing you the opportunity to have your remarks heard.

Mrs Marland: The Minister of the Environment was not under the marquee where the announcement was being made by the Premier and the Minister of Natural Resources, so I do not stand corrected. However, for those of us who cherish the kind of property that the Rouge Valley and the Rouge tablelands provide to this province, we would have been very happy to have been there standing in any kind of weather and being in the all-outdoors; but not this—I will not say what I was going to say—rather perishable Liberal government that has to be protected from inclement weather. The fact is that the Rouge Valley lands are a prize, they are to be cherished and the weather has no relationship.

The fact that the Minister of the Environment no longer makes these big announcements is very significant because we keep asking, where is this Minister of the Environment? Where was the Minister of the Environment for one whole week during the Hagersville tire fire? Where was he? Members can ask anyone who was there, who lived in that community or anyone in the media. I do not believe it is his choice, by the way. I think the Minister of the Environment has been an individual sincerely committed to his portfolio, but for some reason, because he does not set his own program entirely, when he sits at the cabinet table and the cabinet sweepstakes start and the money starts getting doled out, I think that the Minister of the Environment is having an increasingly tough time. Since we have Project X, whereby it is being decided by an internal government document that some of the priorities for the environment in terms of housing and development in this province will be surpassed, then we really have to know what is going on. What is really going on is that in spite of Bill 114, on the one hand, we do not have a sincere commitment to the environment, on the other hand, by this government.

We believe that for this government to try to put on a big show—now, we do not know when the election will be, but whenever it is, the government wants to be able to say: "Look, we've got Bill 114. We now have Clean Sweep. We now have a commitment to the environment." Well, Mr Speaker, I want to tell you that a commitment to the environment is not by saying we will take some more money from the lottery funds. The environment is too important to be dependent on the will of lottery profits. If there was a sincere commitment to the environment by this government, it would not be dependent on Bill 114 to decide that this is how it is going to protect the

environment. What is even worse is there is no commitment in Bill 114 as to how many dollars or what percentage of dollars. As I read at the very beginning, it simply says they may be available. "May be available to be appropriated" is the wording. Well, there is no commitment there.

There are some very serious implications in discussing Bill 114 this afternoon. I want to say that last October, when Bill 119 was discussed in committee, the Treasurer tried to justify diverting lottery funds from fitness, sports, recreation, culture and the arts to hospital operations in the Ontario Trillium Foundation. At that time he promised about \$120 million per year for the next three years to sports, culture and other section-9 activities. However, when you consider that the total lottery profits for 1990-1991 are estimated to be \$493 million, \$120 million is nothing to boast about. If \$120 million is the amount to be spent on fitness, recreation and culture this year—and it is impossible to determine from the estimates whether that promise is being fulfilled—that means \$356 million is being spent on hospitals, since \$17 million is going to the Ontario Trillium Foundation.

So we have to say: "Where is the commitment? How is it going to be fulfilled?" There is no confirmation of this in the estimates, and I think that speaks louder than anything else. Given that physical fitness, recreation and cultural activities are essential to maintaining our health, to fulfilling the goal this government supposedly adopts of shifting the emphasis of our health care system to health promotion and disease prevention, why is the Liberal government not giving these activities a bigger share of the lottery revenues?

Now the lottery pie is going to be cut into even more pieces. I do not think anyone in this chamber can deny that. The government is telling recreation and cultural groups not to worry. They have their \$120 million promised and, anyway, the Clean Sweep lottery will be a separate game from the other Ontario lottery games.

Now, I would like us to look at some figures. The Treasury estimates that the Clean Sweep lottery will generate \$20 million this fiscal year and \$30 million per year after that, but it also estimates that the total lottery revenues will grow by only \$2 million this year. That means that \$18 million, which would have been spent on the other lottery games, those games that are supposed to support sports, recreation and cultural activities, will now be spent on environmental protection. No matter how you look at it, because of Bill 114, sports, fitness, recreation, culture and the arts are going to get less money than would have otherwise been possible.

1650

Then there is the matter of the supposed dedication of revenues to environmental protection. There is no guarantee in Bill 114 that the money raised by the Clean Sweep lottery will indeed be spent on environmental protection. Our party will be introducing an amendment that, if supported by the government, will ensure the dedication of revenues. We have good reason to doubt the government's intentions as to how the money will be spent.

Just look at the tire tax fiasco. The Treasurer started collecting that tax on 1 June last year, and I should say at this point that before that tire tax bill was passed, I moved three or four amendments to commit the income from the tire tax to be spent on environmental programs. I did not ask that it be spent on any specific environmental program. I asked that it be spent on environmental programs, plural, and that left the full autonomy up to the government.

Now what has happened—and by the way, all my amendments were voted down by the government, so here the government said, "We are going to collect \$5 off every new tire in this province and we are going to spend the money on the environment."

Mr Faubert: That's what they are doing.

Mrs Marland: What is significant—and I think it is rather sad that the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere says that is what they are doing. We now have the figures as to what this Liberal government is doing, and as a member of the Liberal government he should know what they are doing and I am going to tell him what they are doing.

Mr Faubert: I know what they are doing. You are going to tell us what you think they are doing.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs Marland: They are collecting \$45 million per year, and that tax money that they collected was "supposed to help fund efforts to support recycling and environmentally sound disposal," and the Treasurer later clarified that the tax would help prevent environmental time bombs like the Tyre King dump in Hagersville, which later caught fire.

Mr Faubert: Exactly.

Mrs Marland: But before the Hagersville tire fire, the government had spent—Mr Speaker, I recognize I can only speak to you, but this is a question I really wish the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere could answer, because I wonder whether he knows how much of the money that was collected between 1 June and the Hagersville tire fire was spent on these programs. Perhaps he does not even have any idea of how much money was collected, but I can tell him how much money was collected in that time.

Mr Faubert: How much?

Mrs Marland: At that point, it was over \$20 million, and what was spent was \$1 million. Mr Speaker, \$1 million was spent before we had the tire fire, and yet the money had been collected at that point for about eight months.

I think that is really misrepresenting to the people of Ontario where the money was going, and the fact that \$1 million had been spent on tire recycling until we had the fire is a terrible sham. Then finally, after the fire, which was the worst environmental disaster in Ontario's history, the government set up a tire recycling program, so I guess we should be thankful for some things that got this government off its seat.

In any case, even after the fire and even though this government raises \$45 million through this tire tax, it still plans to spend only \$16 million. So our question is, if the government raises \$45 million a year from the tire tax, what is it spending the other \$29 million on?

Mr Faubert: On the environment.

Mrs Marland: This government is not committed to the protection of the environment. Otherwise, they would fulfil their commitment. When they introduced a tire tax—and I may say the people of Ontario balked at the \$5-per-tire tax when it came in. But like all sound, environmentally conscious people, which, fortunately for us, the people of Ontario are—that is why the people of Ontario will reject this government at the next election. They are not fooled. The people of Ontario are very intelligent and they can add and they can read.

If they know that \$45 million has been collected from them on the purchase of their new tires, yet only \$16 million has been

spent on the environmental programs dealing with the disposal of used tires, they are going to see very clearly that they have had \$29 million taken from them that has not been allocated to the program that this government promised.

That is not acceptable to anyone in this province. If they accept taxes and they say it is for a purpose and they do not allocate it for that purpose, I am sorry, that will not wash, and the next election will prove it. Based on the experience with the tire tax and the promises for that money to go to environmental programs, members can understand why I am so sceptical about Bill 114 with the Clean Sweep revenues.

Environmental protection is a terribly important cause. It is one that I spend a great deal of time fighting for in my role as Progressive Conservative spokesperson for the environment. But I do not accept that it is necessary to take money away from cultural and recreational groups, from the arts and sports, in order to protect the environment. The environment rates high enough in terms of priorities for all of us as legislators, high enough that we do not depend on lottery profits and the whim of lotteries to fund that protection.

A loss of \$18 million this year is a lot of money for the cash-starved cultural and recreational groups of this province, some of whom, I may add, are in my own city of Mississauga. That is why it disappoints me to hear the member for Mississauga East rise and defend this bill when there are many, many groups within his own city that are crying out for funding through the lottery profits and their applications are being turned down.

If the member is questioning that, I can refer him to any number of groups that have called my office when their applications have been turned down in the past few years. Surely this money should be left to them. A reassessment of other government spending, including the reduction of government inefficiency and waste, could easily make up that shortfall.

As usual, the government is demonstrating that it does not know how to prioritize its spending and manage its own house. We know that there is not a money tree here at Queen's Park. We know that this government is dependent on the people of Ontario for money. We are not asking them to be miracle workers; we are simply asking them to be honest with the people of Ontario and say to them, "I am sorry, we can't be all things to all people, but what we promise, we will fulfil." Unfortunately, this government does not fulfil its promises. I think the tire tax is an example, where they promised programs and had spent \$1 million before the tire fire. Obviously, they do not plan to fulfil the obligations of their promises.

As usual, in addition to leading taxpayers to buy the Clean Sweep lottery tickets and to believe that they are helping the environment as Bill 114 stands, without any guaranteed dedication of revenues—this is a questionable conclusion. The people of Ontario are not going to be misled.

1700

For the benefit of those members in the House this afternoon—and I see two members in the House from the city of Mississauga; the member for Mississauga West has just come into the House. I would like him and the member for Mississauga East to listen to a letter from the Mississauga Symphonic Association women's committee. It is over the signature of the secretary, Mrs Jo Nunan, and it says:

"Dear Mrs Marland:

"Thank you for your letter and information regarding Bill 114.

"The women's committee of the Mississauga Symphonic Association most certainly opposes Bill 114, in which equitable funding for recreational groups and cultural groups such as the Mississauga Symphony is not mentioned. In our opinion, the cultural wellbeing of our community will be totally ignored by our legislators if Bill 114 is passed."

The Minister of Tourism and Recreation is copied on this letter, as are the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister of Culture and Communications, as of yesterday I guess.

Mr Mahoney: Read us the letter you sent them, Margaret.

Mrs Marland: The date on that letter is 8 May 1990, and the member for Mississauga West is interjecting and he is saying, "Read us the letter that you sent them." The member for Mississauga West insults the Mississauga Symphonic Association if he thinks that anything that I wrote would have mislead them. He does not give them enough credit to understand what Bill 114 is about. If I had not sent them a letter at all and I had simply sent them the bill, the members of that association can read the bill for themselves.

The members of that association understand what Bill 114 says. They know and understand that it takes away more of the lottery profits from their groups. That is all they need to understand, regardless of what my letter says. I would be happy to table in this House a copy of my letter. I happen to have it here. Perhaps if there is time I will read it to the members so that they know that I do not mislead my constituents.

The next letter I want to read for the benefit of the House is from Gymnastics Mississauga, the Mississauga Gym Club, which I believe is in the riding of the honourable member for Mississauga East. This letter is over the signature of Barbara Dring, who is the president:

"Dear Mrs Marland:

"We are in receipt of your letter of 23 April regarding Bill 114.

"We are in agreement with you regarding the designation of funds from the lottery corporation.

"We feel the government should certainly take some action over the protection of the environment but not at the expense of cultural and recreational groups.

"We have many dedicated volunteers helping us to provide first-class gymnastics to the community but we also need some support in some form from the government. The dilution of the moneys supplied by the lottery corporation will have a far-reaching impact on all cultural and sports groups and we must voice our strong disapproval of Bill 114."

As I said, it is signed by Barbara Dring, and that letter was received 17 May, although it is undated. I should say that the letter from the Mississauga Symphonic Association was dated 8 May 1990.

Finally, I have a letter from a lady called Marilyn McCool, and she is president of the Tecumseh Tennis Club and she resides at 1427 Woodeden Drive North, which is in my riding. I have not spoken to Mrs McCool and do not know her, but I think that she has written an excellent letter from the standpoint that here is a citizen who well understands what Bill 114 is about.

I think also that for the benefit of the members in the House today who are questioning my letter to my cultural, sports and recreational groups—and I would actually challenge those members, especially the members for Mississauga East and Mississauga West, who are saying, "Tell us what your letter said."

I challenge them: Did they send out a copy of Bill 114? Have they had any communication with these groups to tell them what Bill 114 was about? Did they do a mailing to tell the members of these organizations who live within the city of Mississauga what was coming down from this Liberal government? If they did, they will have an opportunity to tell me at the end of my presentation this afternoon, and I would be very interested to know whether they had letters from groups that support Bill 114.

Actually, this letter I am going to read, I am copied on it but it is addressed to the minister.

Hon Mr Black: What's the date?

Mrs Marland: It is dated 25 May, so it may be possible that the minister has not had time to read this letter yet.

Hon Mr Black: I haven't received it.

Mrs Marland: With the thousands of letters that he is receiving from all over the province in opposition to Bill 114, I would not expect that he would have had time or will have the opportunity to read them, but I hope that his staff at least collates them and tells him the kind of concern there is in this province about this bill.

"Dear Honourable Ken Black:

"I am strongly opposed to Bill 114. It is time that our provincial government and health care professionals realized the importance of recreation and cultural programs as a valuable contribution to our society's mental and physical health. With today's added stresses (long working hours, increased taxes, traffic problems, etc) it is not surprising that we are seeing alarming increases in mental breakdowns, job burnout, teen violence, drug abuse and marriage breakdowns. Recreation and cultural activities provide a much-needed outlet for relieving these many stresses. Exercise and elimination of stress have been proven to build up one's immune system, making him/her better able to ward off infections and improving control of certain diseases. Instead of promoting exercise, we are using our health care system to treat a myriad of symptoms that could be prevented.

"We have a health care system that is out of control. Rather than correcting the mismanagement and abuses within this system, the Ontario Lottery Corp is supplying it with still more finances to continue operating in this pattern. Our health care system needs to be held more accountable. The many disease states that do require medication, surgery, etc could be funded by the ever-increasing taxes we pay if such abuse did not exist. User fees would discourage needless visits to physicians and put some financial responsibility on those individuals who benefit from such. It may even encourage individuals to change their lifestyle to ensure that they do enjoy a healthier status. In addition to the taxes we pay to support our health care system, many individuals and corporations contribute generously to such worthwhile causes as the Canadian Cancer Society, the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario, and hospitals to mention only a few. Research and development is being carried out and financed by the large multinational drug companies that have committed themselves to provide even more funding over the coming years.

"The Ontario Lottery Corp was founded with the sole purpose of promoting recreation and culture. Bills 119 and 114 ensure the erosion and perhaps the demise of funding recreational sports, cultural programs, and fitness programs in Ontario. Environmental issues can only be rectified and discouraged from happening by ensuring that those individuals

or industries that cause them are financially responsible to remedy the problem.

"Government raises the taxes on cigarettes and alcohol from time to time until costs of these items are almost or more than double what they should be. This is done because they pose a health risk. Why aren't items that create environmental problems such as disposable diapers, for example, hit with a similar tax like gasoline? The revenue created from this could then be directed back to the municipalities that have to pay for the garbage this creates. It should be the individuals and industries that cause the problem who are held accountable. Why penalize recreation and culture? They serve to get our youth involved in worthwhile activities. I would much prefer to see my children and others involved in tennis, rowing clubs, baseball, skating, swimming, etc as opposed to idling their time away hanging around shopping malls and video arcades. It's commendable that government is running slick, expensive campaigns to warn youth of the dangers of drug abuse and the importance of safe sex. It is not commendable that they are neglecting the importance of providing other alternatives. The youths are our future; yet, they are taking a back seat to every other issue. Perhaps it may be wise to invest in their future (and consequently ours) as well.

1710

"Recreational and cultural activities in their own way already do much to promote the health and wellbeing of our citizens. Through such activities, individuals become more aware of their community and more conscious of their environment. If the government wants to ensure that individuals take more responsibility for their own health and the environment, they had better be certain that some incentives are in place to do so. Otherwise, we become an apathetic society concerned only with what happens within our own four walls. Recreation and cultural activities are a most vital part of all communities. Of what avail is all the extra moneys being pumped into the health care system and the environment if individuals are not looked after first and foremost? Bill 119 has already greatly diminished the funds allotted to recreation and culture; Bill 114 will only further this reality! I strongly urge you to say 'No' to Bill 114."

"Yours sincerely,

"Marilyn McCool

"President of the Tecumseh Tennis Club."

Mr Furlong: Read your letter, Margaret, the one you sent.

Mrs Marland: That lady, for the benefit of the member for Durham Centre, had not received my letter. In fact, I feel it is very significant that that lady, Mrs McCool, went to that much trouble to write to the minister and express her very real concerns about the implications.

In case anyone in this House would dare stand up and suggest that if people are opposed to Bill 114, they are opposed to the protection of the environment, they had better look very carefully at what kind of priority we in the Progressive Conservative Party place on the environment. What we are saying very loudly is we believe that the environment is a far greater priority in terms of preservation than to be funded out of the profits of an already beleaguered lottery fund corporation.

It just seems that every time this government looks for some money—and Lord knows why it has to keep looking for more locations for money, because with a 131% tax increase in the last three years in this province and 34 individual tax increases it has buckets of money. We just do not know where they are spending it. They are certainly not spending it on new

environmental programs. That is confirmed by the fact that the most recent one, as I referred to earlier, the tire tax, is \$29 million, and we do not even know where it is being spent.

Bill 114 simply says: "Oh yes, of course, we've got this cash cow. It's called lottery profits. Why don't we announce a new lottery and give people the opportunity to believe that they're going to spend money on the environment by supporting the new lottery called Clean Sweep." Nowhere in this bill are the revenues from the new lottery called Clean Sweep guaranteed to be spent on the environment. That is why I am opposed to this bill, because it misrepresents the facts. It does not say that the money will be appropriated to the protection of the environment. Unless it says that, what it is saying is that we will have another form of taxation on those people who can least afford it.

We know, through many studies, that the people who buy lottery tickets are the people, in the majority, who can least afford it. If this government thinks the solution to protecting the environment is to add another opportunity for people to be taxed through the purchase of lottery tickets and then turn around and say, "But you're supporting the protection of the environment," I say to this government, "Show those people who have paid \$5 on their new tires in the past almost 12 months where their money has gone to protect the environment."

Mr. Sola: I would like to thank the member for the free publicity, but I note there is a tone of envy in her voice when she mentions "balanced budget," which she did about a dozen times in her speech. I can understand the tone of envy, seeing as how her government left us with a \$2.6-billion deficit the last year it was in power.

Second, she asks whether I have had calls from school boards. Yes, I have. They are saying, "Thank you for the \$95 million in 1987, the \$157 million in 1988, the \$92 million in 1989." They are saying, "Thank you, but we need more because Mississauga is growing at such a fast rate that we cannot build the schools fast enough to accommodate the kids."

I would like to point out the reason we are getting thanks from the school boards is they have to compare this to \$75 million allocated for capital construction to the whole province the last year that the Tories were in power. The region of Peel is getting more than the whole province used to get.

When she mentions cuts to municipalities, I find that a little bit strange. An 11% increase in transfer funds to municipalities is called a cut? She says we are ignoring the needs of municipalities; \$5 billion is ignoring needs? I have heard of "What's a million?" but now she is saying, "What's \$5 billion?" That is getting a little bit ridiculous.

Then she says the budget of the Ministry of the Environment was cut by \$341 million, or something along those lines. I would like to point out that an agency was established, which is still under the Ministry of the Environment, to handle that.

Mr. Neumann: I want to thank the member for the fine speech she gave and for mentioning me several times during her comments. I would like to point out, however, that she neglected to inform herself about the economic and environmental policies of this government. She kept talking about the spending within the Ministry of the Environment as if that is the only area of involvement this government has with respect to the environment.

I would remind her that the concept of sustainable development, which she should be aware of, implies that every ministry of the government is interested in the environment and that the

environment should be taken into consideration in all decision-making within government. We recently had an announcement by the Ministry of Government Services applying this concept to purchasing throughout the province by this government, and that is an environmental decision. As a critic in the environmental area, she seems to have a very narrow concept of what it means to be interested in the environment.

Hopefully, I have helped to edify her in this regard. I think she is really barking up the wrong tree when she is looking around the room and asking for quorum calls when there really was a quorum, when in fact there has been no one from her caucus supporting her on this fine speech that she gave here, not one person in her caucus other than herself her supporting her, and she has the nerve to criticize us for not having people in the House.

I see a fine Tory has joined the member there. Hopefully, with his wisdom, he can give her some advice on how to handle these matters. Anyway, I was very much taken aback when she called my interjections obnoxious because I only interjected when she got off track.

1720

Mr. Farnan: I thought I should add a view other than the government view in terms of a critique of my colleague who has spoken so eloquently. It is very unfortunate in debating an issue like this that we find people who simply want to be negative. We have to look at the bill, and if there are positive things about it, we have to look at those. If there are criticisms, then we can make amendments.

In looking at the statement of the previous speaker, I think my colleague made some good points. The point that I think is essential is the reality that this bill really does not do very much.

The present situation is that the profits from lotteries may be directed to sports, culture, recreation, etc., or to the Trillium Foundation, or to hospitals, for that matter. However, the reality of the matter is that it goes into a slush fund and the government has the option of where it is directed. The reality of the matter is that no one knows whether it is tax dollars or lottery dollars that are going to pay for education or the environment or anything else.

The only thing that this bill does, I suggest, is allow the government to market more aggressively lottery tickets by allowing them, instead of having a javelin thrower or an orchestra on the ticket, to put on the ticket a crippled child or a forest or a lake and in that way to more aggressively market lottery tickets. I think the government will sell more lottery tickets because it will aggressively market them under those headings. Whether or not that is a good thing I do not know.

Mr. Mahoney: I would just like to make a couple of comments. First of all, I, and I am sure many of the folks in Mississauga South, have always felt that the member for Mississauga South was quite capable of leading her entire caucus, and she has proven today that she indeed has done that, so I do not see the fact that they are not here as a negative thing. I think they have complete confidence in her ability to lead the caucus. Had she stood for the leadership in the recent—there was a campaign recently, I think, was there not? There was something I saw in the news about somebody running for leader, and we in Mississauga thought it should have been the member for Mississauga South and I just want her to know that.

With regard to the letters that the member for Mississauga South was reading, I received a couple of calls from people who said they had gotten a letter from the member for Mississauga

South. They were absolutely astounded when they read this letter—

An hon member: Read the letter.

Mr Mahoney: I do not have it here, unfortunately. If the member would bring it here, I would be delighted to read it.

—at the one-sided approach.

In fact, the reason they were calling me—and members must understand, I think even a couple of them were Tories at one time in their lives—was that they could not believe that any piece of legislation could be as dastardly as the member for Mississauga South portrayed this bill to be in her letter. They said, “Can this possibly be true?” On the other side of the coin, they were saying, “Can we possibly believe that the honourable member for Mississauga South would mislead us?” They found that to be absolutely astounding, and so they called me to get an opinion. I assumed—

Mrs Marland: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I take exception to the member for Mississauga West suggesting that I would mislead.

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr Mahoney: She did not let me finish. I assured the people who called me that the member would not mislead them, but she simply did not understand the bill and was incapable of putting it forward in a way that they could understand it.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the member for Mississauga South wish to respond?

Mrs Marland: Yes, I do, just briefly. In response to the member for Mississauga West, I have to say that I wish someone would give him a new speech. Every time I speak, for two and a half years now, he has used the same rebuttal. I do think it is time that somebody gave him some new lines.

When he says that the school boards say “Thank you” to him, I really think that he attends the same meetings I do with those school boards, and his own school board—I think it is his own school board—the Dufferin-Peel Roman Catholic Separate School Board, had an announcement this year, I think, of around \$60 million. However, when you look very closely at it, this year they get \$6 million, next year they get \$7 million and in 1993 they get \$48 million.

So here we have this marvellous shell game of multi-year announcements. What I cannot find out from the Treasury is—every year we get multi-year announcements; last year all the school boards got multi-year announcements. The Treasury will not tell me whether the funds that were announced last year for this year are included in this year's, again, multi-year announcements.

Anyway, it is safe to say I simply do not envy the member for Mississauga East, and I think the member for Brantford should inform his residents about where the \$29 million of the tire tax has gone.

I simply say to the member for Mississauga West that I appreciate his support for my leadership campaign. I did, however, decide not to run for the leadership, but I am more than capable of explaining to the people of Mississauga the facts of Bill 114. I challenge the member for Mississauga West to explain where in this bill there are any funds guaranteed specifically for the protection of the environment. Where in here does it say how much money will be appropriated?

Mr Farnan: I will be supporting this bill, provided that certain amendments that I will be putting forward are accepted by the government. I think it behooves all of us to look at the

legislation and examine the legislation and see how we can improve that legislation in order to make it better and more acceptable to the people of the province.

I am going to be speaking to each of these amendments. I will inform the House what the amendments are that I will be presenting and in turn I will speak to each of those. I beg for the indulgence of the House, because it concerns an area that I am critically concerned about and that must be addressed in the province of Ontario.

The first amendment I am going to be putting forward is that we amend the legislation so that 0.5% of all lottery profits are designated for gambling rehabilitation treatment clinics. Gambling is a serious addiction in the province of Ontario. It is a health issue and it is a social issue. I will be putting forward to my honourable colleagues in all parties this afternoon several questions which I will attempt to answer.

How has the province responded to the need? What is being done in the province of Ontario to help and provide treatment for those with gambling addictions?

I will look briefly at what is occurring in other jurisdictions. I will ask the question very directly, and I ask all the members of the House to seriously consider this question. Are we, as a government, and I mean not just the Liberal members of the House, I mean all members of the House, all 130 of us, New Democrats, Conservatives and Liberals as a collective group, part of the problem or part of the solution for those with gambling addictions? I will further ask the question of what needs to be done.

There is no question that lotteries produce revenues. Obviously, with the great demands that are put upon governments for services, governments are always interested in ways of generating revenues. The source of revenues from lotteries has increased phenomenally, beyond the wildest dreams, from when they were first introduced. Just in this past year—I think the minister responsible will bear me out when I say this—additional staff have been hired in the marketing of lotteries. There is a much greater determination, much more aggressive marketing in order to capitalize on the profits that can accrue from lotteries and the revenues that can be generated.

1730

I do not think any member of any party is going to object to the fact that a government has to generate funds in order to pay for services. New Democrats certainly have never denied this fact, but as we aggressively market lotteries to increase revenues for services, I think there is a question we have to ask ourselves: Is this the way we want to go?

One of the most overworked phrases in the English language involves just three little words: “Want to bet?” It seems everyone wants to get in on the action and gamble on something: hockey, baseball, football games, horse races, the stock market, cards, bingo, and of course the latest craze, lotteries. When members come right down to it, gambling in one form or another plays a major role in the lives of most people today.

But let's get one thing straight at the outset. I am not here, and neither are my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, to lobby for the curtailment or the abolition of gambling through legislation or any other means. I am not here, and neither is the New Democratic Party, to condemn anybody who gambles. After all, gambling has fascinated mankind down through the ages. The ancient Chinese, Persians, Greeks and Romans gambled. So did every other recorded civilization.

Gambling produces some benefits. I think we can all admit that. It provides employment for many, it serves as a recreation—

al outlet for others, and it certainly creates vast amounts of profits and revenues for individuals and of course for governments.

However, there is also a dark side to gambling, because one of its most insidious byproducts is the creation of compulsive or, as they are known to the medical profession, pathological gamblers.

Initially, it is important to realize that pathological gambling is an illness. It was first recognized as such by the World Health Organization in 1978 and subsequently by the American Psychiatric Association, whose classification of pathological gambling as a mental disease is accepted on a worldwide basis.

Pathological gambling is a mental disorder of impulse control and is widely accepted as the purest form of addiction. However, because it is emotional in nature, its victims do not carry their scars where you can see them. Pathological gamblers therefore are not as easy to identify as alcoholics or addicts. Pathological gamblers do not stagger when they walk. Their speech is not impaired. They do not display unsociable tendencies in public. In fact, they look and act like very average citizens—externally, that is—but inwardly they are consumed by a gambling urge that grows stronger while its victims grow correspondingly weaker to resist. Pathological gambling is progressive in nature and can result in total financial and emotional bankruptcy, sometimes even leading to physical destruction, to suicide.

Pathological gambling is a health issue. More specifically, it is a mental health issue as well as a serious social issue. It costs our economy billions of dollars in terms of lost working hours, loss of creativity and productivity, criminal activities and a great deal of welfare money.

It creates dysfunctional family units and its victims have a far-reaching effect on other members of family, particularly children, and on society as a whole. Today, one pathological gambler's actions will affect approximately seven people he is associated with. Usually they are the people closest to him and the people whom he loves the most. It is ironic that the people whom we love the most are the people who are hurt the most by our actions.

All right. Now we have outlined the general problem. Let's get down to the specifics about pathological gambling in Ontario. I ask the members of the House, how many pathological gamblers do they think there are in this province? A few hundred? A few thousand? How about 100,000? That is right. The best estimates available place the number of pathological gamblers in Ontario at between 100,000 and 150,000 persons. This figure has to be estimated, because there just is not any accurate documentation available here; but based on research done in the United States, where they are far ahead of us in this respect, two to three per cent of the adult population are or will be pathological gamblers.

The United States is well ahead of us in acknowledgement of the seriousness of the pathological gambling problem. The Americans have a well established National Council on Compulsive Gambling, many state councils, research foundations, gamblers' assistance programs operated by the states' departments of human services and more than 60 specialized medical treatment centres simply for those who are addicted to gambling. Would you believe, Mr Speaker, that the tiny, rural state of Iowa operates more than 10 such treatment clinics for pathological gamblers? Iowa and the state of Minnesota are the latest states which recently passed legislation that will provide a percentage of the government's lottery profits for the operation of treatment centres.

Now, while the government of a relatively small farm state like Iowa has adopted such a far-sighted approach to the problem of pathological gambling, what is being done here in affluent Ontario? We do not have any research facilities, not a single treatment clinic and nary a professional training program. It is ironic that the Ontario Ministry of Health consistently denies pathological gambling is a problem, yet OHIP will pay 75% of the medical and hospital costs of treating pathological gamblers from Ontario in the United States. At the moment, pathological gamblers in Ontario do not have a whole lot going for them. Of course, there is the widely respected self-help group known as Gamblers Anonymous, which operates a number of chapters, but most of these are confined to the Toronto area, leaving vast areas of the province unattended.

1740

Then there is the Canadian Foundation on Compulsive Gambling which was created by a group of prominent concerned citizens in 1983. The foundation subsequently applied for and was granted charitable status. Over the past seven years, the foundation has attempted to awaken an apathetic government and public to the dangers of the issues, which could well result in a social epidemic in the coming decade, but the foundation's single full-time employee can hardly do justice to help even those limited numbers of people fortunate enough to stumble upon the only available aid. Nevertheless, the foundation last year processed some 2,000 appeals for help. This was accomplished with little or no advertising.

Imagine how this number would swell if the foundation had the necessary funds to properly proclaim its program. But years of lobbying and extensive negotiations with various government agencies have yielded little of a concrete nature. Only the Ministry of Community and Social Services provides a small annual contribution of \$55,000 in the form of a service contract. That is \$55,000 to service 2% to 3% of the population. The foundation, however, has a minimum operating budget of between \$100,000 and \$200,000 and thus must depend on the private sector for enough funds merely to keep its doors open.

A one-man operation servicing the entire province—indeed servicing the entire country—is being granted \$55,000, and we are making lottery profits this year that will perhaps exceed \$500 million. It is time the government admits it has a responsibility in this matter and helps the foundation fulfil its objectives of heightening awareness through education, conducting research into pathological gambling and providing medical treatment facilities for victims and their families.

Just as it is every bit as much our responsibility to deal with related problems such as alcoholism and drug abuse, we must seriously address the issue of pathological gambling in the 1990s. The government must lead the way in this respect since it has helped introduce a new element which can but lead to the proliferation of the excessive gambling problem. That, of course, is the creation of numerous lotteries, which in effect has set the government up in the gambling business. The government of Ontario, let us all recognize the fact, is in the gambling business and generates a profit of \$500 million per annum. We are part of the process by which people gamble.

This action has served to introduce gambling to millions of people in the province who never gambled before, because you cannot buy a bag of milk or you cannot buy a loaf of bread without having lottery tickets placed in front of you. My friends, when you are inundated with aggressive marketing techniques that night after night after night present to you the dream of winning \$1 million and changing your lifestyle, we all

know it is in our human nature to be affected by that kind of aggressive marketing and particularly if you are poor and your life is tough. It is not just the poor who dream of the good life but certainly if you are under a lot of pressure financially, the thought of winning the million is a golden ray of opportunity.

Every time a parent or a single mom or anybody goes into the corner store they are presented with the opportunity of the dream which is being shown to them on television and newspaper ads in every conceivable manner possible. Of course they put their hand out for that dream and in the process they hand across the \$2. If this is a social flutter it is not a problem, but we know that for some individuals it is going to become more than a social flutter.

Some individuals are going to become addicted and instead of \$2 it is going to be \$10, and instead of \$10 it is going to be \$20. Believe me, if you are on a fixed income and have \$370 coming in and you are spending \$20 of that per week in order to grab the dream of riches, wealth and the good life that we as a government are presenting to the people of Ontario, I say to my colleagues in all parties, let's recognize the fact that for a lot of people, to put out \$20 a week may be an insignificant amount of their budget, but for some people it has affected the bread on the table. It has affected their children. There are very serious consequences.

I am so pleased that the minister is here today to listen to this debate and I know that in private conversations he has expressed to me his own genuine concern about this issue. That is why I am optimistic that something is going to be done because I trust the minister when he says to me, "Mike, I am concerned about this too." I do not believe for one minute they are mere words. I believe that in those words is a commitment.

So we, because we generate our revenues through lotteries, are in fact introducing millions of people by our marketing strategy to gambling, people in smaller communities who previously had no access to gambling save for the occasional poker game or church bingo, people in larger urban centres who previously never saw fit to go out to the racetrack or make a bet with a bookie. These people occasionally went to the racetrack or went to the bookie or maybe never did, but now if they buy a package of cigarettes, if they go and get a bottle of Coke for the kids, there it is. It is right there on every counter of exchange in Ontario. I cannot think of a corner store in my community where you do not have the opportunity to buy lottery tickets.

I am not saying that is wrong, but what I am saying is, some people who never gambled before are being introduced to gambling. I am saying that, for some people, it is going to affect their lives and it is going to affect the lives of their children. My God, this is a very serious social problem. There are children who will not eat properly because of an addiction of their mom or dad. A sickness of their parents is taking away shoes or food from some children in this province.

1750

We do not show that on television. We show the flashy car, we show the boat, we show the dream girls, we show the good life, we show the dream. "This is the dream; buy a ticket." It is as simple as that. "Pay \$2 down and, my goodness, you are going to be magically moved into a whole new way of life." We are all moved by that.

I buy the odd ticket. I do not buy many tickets; I suppose once every couple of months when I am in the store. I do not know whether I do it even subconsciously. I do not know whether it is just that I have been watching baseball and the advertisements have come on, it has gotten into my subcon-

scious and so I buy a ticket. But it is not so bad, because the ticket I buy represents a very small amount of my income and I do not have a compulsion to buy more or to buy them every time I see them.

This is a truly important issue that we address. I think it is an issue almost of conscience. I would hate to think that because of my actions as a legislator and because of my combined actions with my friends, my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, the members elected as Conservatives and the members elected as Liberals—because in the end all 130 of us have the power to do something—there are going to be casualties. The reality of the matter is we have to do something about treatment.

In a relatively short period of time we have gone from the point where it was a crime to buy lottery tickets to the stage where the government openly encourages their sale. That is true. In a relatively short period of time we have moved from when it was illegal to now, where the government is bringing in the smartest brains, the most creative advertising experts, because we look at these and they are brilliant. I look at those ads and I say the creators of those ads are brilliant.

I suspect, and I am couching it in these terms, the reason for Bill 114 and Bill 119 is simply this: Bill 119 allowed the creative geniuses who advertise lotteries to say: "Hey, let's put hospitals on the ticket. Let's put the crippled children on the ticket. Let's put the cancer treatment centre on the ticket. Hey, isn't that powerful?" On the one hand, they create an image that if you buy a ticket, you are going to have this wonderful dream life where you are going to win the \$1 million and, on the other hand, there is this little crippled child. We all want to help the little crippled child. We all want cancer treatment in the province.

I think the creative geniuses within the ministry said: "Look, we can sell more lottery tickets if we can use the environment. We all know that the polls are saying to us that the hottest item right now is the environment. Well, let's cash in on it, for goodness' sake. Let's have trees. Let's have lakes. Let's have pure rivers." Of course, it makes sense, if all you want to do is sell more lottery tickets.

As I said, New Democrats, Conservatives, Liberals, I do not think any party can say that government must not raise revenue; it has to raise revenue. But let's think of what we are doing. Let's think of the manner in which we are raising the revenue. Let's examine our modus operandi and let's say to ourselves: "The result of Bill 114 and the result of Bill 119 are simply that we will sell more tickets and all of the money will go into a general slush fund anyway. The department of parks and recreation will get some, hospitals will get some and the environment will get some."

But I know, the minister knows and all the members of this House know that when you take the consolidated revenue, no one knows whether it is lottery dollars or tax dollars, whether it is a direct tax dollar from an individual or a company or a licence fee or a fishing or hunting licence. It is all in there and we can spend it on anything.

We could take this legislation and we could add education and roads. We could add all the different things, if we thought it would sell extra lottery tickets, but a hole in the road does not sell as many lottery tickets as a crippled child. A hole in the road does not sell as many lottery tickets as clean lakes and rivers. We have to think—we have to really think—about what we are doing.

This tremendous increase in legalized gambling now nets the Ontario Lottery Corp more than \$500 million per year.

Surely the corporation should be prepared and willing to return a small portion of this mind-boggling amount of money to the victims of pathological gambling.

I am asking for 0.5% of all profits; not 1%, 0.5%. I am asking for less than \$2.5 million to be returned to help the victims of gambling, who will be the inevitable casualties of our expanded lottery program.

Surely the corporation should be prepared and willing to return this money. Pathological gambling creates a growing problem within a certain section of this province's population. It is this government's duty to address the problem of who is responsible for its creation, because it is a health and a social issue.

Acting responsibly would foster education, research, treatment and prevention of pathological gambling. Denying, closing our eyes to the fact that such a problem exists simply is not good enough any more. If this government persists in that attitude, we can easily have a major social crisis on our hands in a short period of time. That is something you can bet on.

I have several case studies of pathological gamblers, individuals involved with lottery tickets. I want to read these into

the record and I will do that when the debate recommences tomorrow.

In closing my remarks for this evening, I am again encouraged by the words the minister spoke to me, admittedly privately, but as I said, I trust the minister. The minister has said he shares my concern. When the minister says that to me, it says two things. He recognizes that pathological gambling is a problem. That is number one. Number two, the minister is going to do something about it.

In this amendment, I am putting forward a very constructive and fairly moderate request: that we amend the legislation so that 0.5% of lottery profits be returned for the treatment of those who suffer from the disease of pathological gambling.

That is a good first step. If the government accepts that first amendment, I will then support the bill. I will be talking about the other amendments I would like the government to support tomorrow.

It being 6 o'clock, I move adjournment of the debate.

On motion by Mr Farnan, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1801.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS
(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaitre, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Christine E.	York East	L	
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn.	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines, Minister of Culture and Communications

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Floyd Laughren, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reyecraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Ruth A. Grier, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D. Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Shelley Martel, Lily Oddie Munro, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, James F. McGuigan, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: Joan M. Fawcett

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Cameron Jackson, David E. Neumann, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray

Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Wednesday 30 May 1990

Members' statements		Student discipline	1407
Islamic documentary	1399	Mrs Cunningham	
Mr Kormos		Mr Conway	
Brigid Pyke	1399	Regulation of financial institutions	1408
Mr J. M. Johnson		Mr M. C. Ray	
Adopt-a-Park	1399	Mr Elston	
Mr Furlong		Post-secondary education financing	1408
Workers' compensation	1399	Mr Philip	
Miss Martel		Mr Conway	
OPP facilities	1399	Farm tax rebate	1409
Mr McLean		Mr Harris	
Doctors' training	1400	Mr Ramsay	
Mr Kozyra		Energy efficiency	1409
Competition among school boards	1400	Ms Oddie Munro	
Mr R. F. Johnston		Mrs McLeod	
Trucking industry	1400	Inquests	1410
Mr Wiseman		Mr Mackenzie	
Games for the disabled	1400	Mr Offer	
Mr Cleary		Greater Toronto area rapid transit	1410
		Mr Cousens	
		Mr Wrye	
Statements by the ministry		Female offenders	1411
Long-term care	1401	Mrs LeBourdais	
Mr Beer		Mr Patten	
Correctional facilities	1401	Ontario economy	1411
Mr Patten		Mr Laughren	
		Mr Kwinter	
		Case of Timothy Garland	1411
		Mr Sterling	
		Mr Scott	
Responses		Layoffs	1412
Long-term care	1401	Mr Hampton	
Mr Allen		Mr Phillips	
Correctional facilities	1402		
Mr Farnan		Report by committee	
Long-term care	1402	Standing committee on regulations and private bills .	1412
Mrs Cunningham		Ms Oddie Munro	
Correctional facilities	1402	Agreed to	1412
Mr Cureatz			
Oral questions		Second readings	
Resignation of cabinet minister	1404	Ontario Lottery Corporation Amendment	
Mr B. Rae		Act, 1990, Bill 114	1412
Mr Peterson		Mrs Cunningham	
Constitutional accord	1405	Mr Kerrio	
Mr B. Rae		Mr Pouliot	
Mr Peterson		Mr McLean	
Mr Harris		Mr Sola	
Resignation of cabinet minister	1406	Mr Hampton	
Mr Harris		Mr Neumann	
Mr Peterson		Mrs Marland	
Solid waste reduction	1407	Mr Farnan	
Mrs Grier		Mr Mahoney	
Mr Peterson		Adjourned	1430

Other business	Adjournment	1430
Elspeth Heyworth	Lists of members	
Mr Reville		
Mrs Cunningham	Members and their responsibilities	1431
Mr Scott	Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1434
Visitor		
The Speaker		

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mercredi 30 mai 1990

Déclarations ministérielles	Établissements correctionnels	1401
Soins de longue durée	M. Patten	
M. Beer		



Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 31 May 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 31 mai 1990

Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 31 May 1990

The House met at 1000.

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mrs Cunningham moved second reading of Bill 166, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Mrs Cunningham: It is with some degree of satisfaction that I speak in this House today about a piece of legislation that I think, if accepted by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, will seek in its own way to prevent serious injuries to young people and any cyclists in Ontario. The request, of course, and the intent of the legislation is that people who are riding bicycles should be asked by law to wear helmets, such as this one.

Two years after my first attempt to do this, we now have a Canadian-approved bicycle helmet with a CSA sticker inside available right across Canada in our own sporting goods stores. We did wait for some length of time so that they would be readily available to families and to people who ride bicycles on our roads and on our streets.

Of course, everyone knows that a bike helmet cannot keep someone from falling off a bicycle, but it can prevent the majority of head injuries that do take place in our province and in our country. If we insist on buckled seatbelts, we should also insist on bike helmets, I think, every time we get on a bike. Both of them are preventive measures. Both of them have been well researched.

There are many studies in our province, in our country and across North America that advise us as parents, certainly as teachers, as citizens and as politicians about the wonderful preventive response by people who wear bike helmets. When someone wears a bicycle helmet, first, the injuries are less severe and, second, there are far fewer of them. We already know that football and hockey players, police and construction workers all keep their heads safe. I think the time has come, certainly in Ontario and right across the world, that there is enough good information that tells us that people who ride bicycles should do everything they can.

We also know that there have been many public awareness campaigns. They are not new, but we are not getting the kind of response we need through the public awareness campaigns—and I will talk about those in just a little while—to prevent the many tragedies involving bicycles. More and more people are travelling by bicycle and, if they are sharing the roadways with our motor vehicles, they should be properly protected.

We already have, as part of the Highway Traffic Act, a section that says, and this is the one that we are amending, "No person shall ride on or operate a motorcycle, motor-assisted bicycle"—and we are saying "or bicycle;" that is the only change—"on a highway unless he or she is wearing a helmet that complies with the regulations and the chin strap of the helmet is securely fastened under the chin." It is a rather simple amendment. It does, however, have far-reaching effects. The far-reaching effects are to prevent serious head injuries and to

improve the quality of life of many, many citizens in our province.

When I distributed the information to my colleagues in the House, I did advise them that between three and seven million Canadians ride bicycles at least once a year, representing between 15% and 30% of the population. That is a Statistics Canada number. Of the 5,000 bicycle accidents recorded in 1987, 94% occurred during clear visibility, so it was not a matter of people not being able to see clearly, it was not even a matter of poor weather; 88% occurred despite no apparent bicycle defect. Basically, when people are injured while riding bicycles, their bicycles are in good condition.

A study conducted from June 1984 to December 1986 revealed that bicycle accidents were responsible for 25% of the fatalities reported in the trauma unit of the Hospital for Sick Children of Toronto. Imagine, 25% of the fatalities were young children who did not have bicycle helmets on and who were in fact riding bicycles.

A survey of the coroners' offices in Ontario found that 14% of all paediatric injury deaths in Ontario from 1985 to 1987 were attributed to bicycle accidents. We tried to update these numbers, but were unable to do that. We only have the numbers to 1987. This means that 55 out of 393 accidents, virtually all these deaths, resulted from head injuries.

1010

From January 1988 to August 1988, the Metropolitan Toronto Police reported 754 bicycle-related injuries, and three people died as a result of these injuries. They were between the ages of 15 and 34.

We could go on to talk about what we see around our province with young people with head injuries, and we know in fact that the Ontario Medical Association is very concerned about what it sees, what physicians see in their own offices and the young people they see in emergency wards of hospitals. I myself am the mother of a head-injured son, not because he was not wearing a bicycle helmet but because in fact he did not wear a seatbelt. I know it has taken a great toll on him, and his quality of life has changed significantly to the point that he can never be alone again. I just think we have a wonderful opportunity here to make changes for young people in this province.

In June 1989, just last spring, the OMA was so concerned about this that, in its great interest in promoting bicycle safety, it had a campaign encouraging the public to wear safety helmets when cycling to help prevent head injuries. In June they sent out some 13,000 promotional pieces, large posters which I did not bring, but they did have a very large public forum. They did in fact say that the increasing public awareness on behalf of the professions concerned about the management of our health care system included anything they could do to prevent head injuries. I think the easiest suggestion they have, and what they have chosen to promote, is the wearing of bicycle helmets whenever anyone is on a cycle. In June 1989, all of us were aware of their press release where they say, "We want to alter attitudes towards recreational bicycle riding so that a proper helmet is viewed as part of a bicycle rider's basic equipment." It went on to talk about the same statistics that I have talked about.

We also know that we have in Ontario, and we are very fortunate to have, a group of people, basically parents, educators and people in the health care professions, who do anything they can to prevent head injuries. That association is called the Ontario Head Injury Association. They say: "Remember, accidents causing head injuries can happen anywhere—on sidewalks, driveways and bike paths as well as the street. You and your children cannot predict when an injury will happen." So they put out pamphlets such as this, where they say, "How can I get my children to wear their helmets?" There are many ideas for parents. It goes on to say, "A bicycle is not a toy; it's your child's first vehicle."

I know there will be some concern on the part of my colleagues in this House about enforcement. I would be prepared to go into some detail if requested to do so. There is precedent for this legislation in the province of Manitoba, where they recently required infants to wear helmets. I must say at the same time that the fines vary in our province for people who break the Highway Safety Act. The fine can be anywhere from just a warning right up to not less than \$40 and not more than \$200 for anyone who contravenes any of the provisions of the act. These are for pedestrian offences as well, so even pedestrians who break the Highway Safety Act can in fact be warned and then fined. In Manitoba they are not fining people yet. They feel they will phase that in over a period of time.

I would like to close by saying that I would be prepared to answer any questions on the part of my colleagues in this House. My intent was, at the appropriate time, to have this bill referred to committee where concerns can be expressed and questions can be answered, and perhaps we can get our own administration to advise us how it can best be implemented. It is law in Manitoba, it is law in the state of Maryland and I would encourage the province of Ontario to do the same.

Mr Miller: It gives me great pleasure to rise this morning and participate in the debate on mandatory helmet use and standards for child bicycle carriers brought forward in Bill 166 by the member for London North.

First of all, I would like to publicly congratulate the member in her recent campaign for leader of the third party. We have always admired her ability and we would like to wish her well.

I think that bringing forward a bill such as this in this Legislature is another indication that we are all concerned about the welfare of our young people in the province. As a father and a grandfather of 13—and I am expecting the 14th, to make it an even number—I am very much aware of the bicycle and what it does for our young people. It is the first mode of transportation. Even my son does considerable riding. When he comes to Toronto on business he brings his bike along with him. I did not realize he could ride so far within the city limits.

I am responding on behalf of the Minister of Transportation to the introduction of the private member's bill by the member for London North proposing amendments to the Highway Traffic Act requiring all those riding bicycles to wear helmets and that any young child being transported on a bicycle be carried in an approved child carrier.

Let me begin by assuring the member for London North, as well as the rest of my colleagues in this House, that bicycle safety is and has been of the highest priority for the Ministry of Transportation. Bicycle riding has become very popular in Ontario and recent trends indicate that it will continue to grow in popularity by both adults and children. The safety of these riders is extremely important and can be enhanced by riding their bicycles properly, following the rules of the road and protecting themselves from serious injury by wearing a helmet.

I might add that in the last couple of weeks we had a couple of grandsons who could not handle their bikes and they did fall off and end up with some scratches on their foreheads. Those accidents can happen.

The ministry actively promotes the use of helmets by cyclists. Last year the ministry co-operated with the Ontario Medical Association in a province-wide campaign to educate bicyclists about the benefits of wearing a helmet. This campaign was prompted by recent studies in the United States of America that showed that 75% of bicycle fatalities are due to head injuries.

As well, to educate Ontario's bicycling population the ministry has stressed helmet use in all its bicycle safety informational literature that has been distributed to the general public, schools, police forces and bicycling associations across the province.

Last week we had a Lions Club Ride for Sight, where 100 bicyclists left Courtland and rode to Fort Erie. They raised \$35,000. It was headed up by one Dennis Craddock, a member of the Jarvis Lions Club, and was very, very successful. They were stressing the fact of safety and they were looking forward to next year's participation and enforcing and protecting the riders who are going to be riding in that particular event.

At the moment, no jurisdiction in North America or Europe has made bicycle helmet use mandatory, and Canadian bicycle helmet standards for children and adults are, so far, incomplete. The Canadian Standards Association has recently published a cycling helmet standard for persons over the age of five and is planning, in the near future, to amend this standard to be suitable for very young children.

Before considering legislation in the area of bicycle helmet use, the Minister of Transportation would like to first monitor the effects of increased public education efforts by his ministry and other organizations. He would also prefer to await the development of uniform acceptable standards for the design of bicycle helmets for riders of all ages.

On the subject of bicycle child carriers, the ministry has been carefully studying this issue as well. The ministry does not promote or recommend the practice of carrying children in a child carrier due to the potential danger of children, since there is presently no Canadian standard for child carriers either.

The ministry is aware that the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has been distributing information to the general public on the safe use of child carriers for those parents wishing to use them, in recognition that the proper use of child carriers requires education and, I might add, practice in riding with those young children on the back of the bike. The adult cyclist has to be aware that the addition of a child carrier on a bicycle will create a change in the load distribution and will affect steering. Studies have shown that accidents involving bicycles with a child carrier are primarily due to cyclist error caused by the additional weight of the child, as opposed to faults with the actual carrier.

1020

In discussions with the medical profession, the ministry has been informed that the injuries resulting from accidents involving bicycles with carriers tend to be head injuries. Therefore, we feel the preferred approach is to focus on head protection initiatives as opposed to the development of carrier standards.

In closing, we can assure the member for London North that the Ministry of Transportation will continue to promote bicycle safety with an emphasis on head protection. Before considering mandatory helmet legislation, the ministry prefers to monitor

the experiences of other jurisdictions, the effects of increased public education and the progress of the Canadian Standards Association certification program.

With those comments, we would like to congratulate the member for London North for bringing the bill forward, but we perhaps will not give support for bringing it into legislation, for the reason I have just given.

Mrs Grier: I am very pleased to have an opportunity to participate in this debate today. I approach it strictly as a private member because when I was asked to participate in the debate, I had not made up my mind, and I am still not sure that I have. So it is very refreshing to have an opportunity to listen to the arguments and then decide in 40 minutes which way I am going to vote. At this point I may say to the member for London North that I think I am more on her side than on the other, but there are arguments to be put in both directions.

I guess one of my reservations is that I am concerned we are into regulating everything. I say that because every time I ask the Minister of the Environment to regulate protection of the environment, he says: "Oh, you're always wanting regulations. That's the socialist approach." I think he is quite wrong in his ideological and rather doctrinaire approach to what socialism is. In my version of socialism it is our obligation to create the conditions that make it easy for individuals to assume responsibility for their own lives and to make their own decisions. I come to bicycling with somewhat the same approach, that I wish one did not have to regulate everything and require perhaps the wearing of helmets on all cyclists.

As someone who cycles occasionally and casually, I know that when I pull out my bicycle on a bright spring day and decide to go and buy the paper or a jug of milk on my bicycle instead of walking or by car, I am going to consider it somewhat of an inconvenience if I have to put on a helmet. By the same token, when I see my young grandson beginning to learn to ride even his tricycle I am very relieved that my son, his father, has bought a helmet and is requiring him to wear it. I must confess it never crossed my mind when my three children were learning to ride a bicycle that they should wear helmets, but living in a city today, it is required.

I learned to ride my bicycle on a country road, because I remember being unseated into a large patch of brambles on my first attempt. Well, I guess if two cars passed per day, that was all that ever happened. Certainly in wartime Ireland there were no more than that. Today's conditions are entirely different, so perhaps we come to the point where it is required that we begin to regulate.

I have been interested in cycling ever since, as a casual cyclist, I got my front wheel caught in a storm sewer grating on a busy street in Etobicoke and was very pleased thereafter to be able to get the works department to design its gratings in such a way that my front wheel no longer did get caught in the new gratings because they were on an angle. Those are the kinds of changes that make it safer for cyclists. Perhaps we have to begin to look at what can be done in the broad context to recognize that cycling is an appropriate way to travel, not only on country roads but in the cities, and at what can we do in the general context to make cycling safer.

I introduced a private member's bill requiring cyclists to identify themselves to the police when they are stopped for a violation of the Highway Traffic Act; a private member's bill, I may say, that was prompted by the policeman in 21 Division, the division in my constituency, who came to me and said: "We have this real problem with cyclists on sidewalks, be they children or adults. When we ask them their name and address so

that we can hold them accountable for knocking someone down if they are riding on a sidewalk, as has happened, they do not have to give it to us. They can give us a false name, and there is nothing we can do about it."

So I introduced my private member's bill and, as I say, I am pleased that the minister incorporated that into his new legislation and regulations regarding cyclists. Perhaps the same thing will happen to the bill from the member for London North if it is approved by this House today.

I think that the amendments the minister introduced, as well as my amendment, contribute to what I think is necessary in the way of a broader system of safety for cycling. The fact that "bicycle" is now clearly included in the definition of a vehicle and that bicyclists are not permitted to ride their bicycles across the sidewalk or a pedestrian crossover and must walk their bicycle across the road, helps to improve safety.

There are now in the regulations clear indications that a cyclist should give when changing direction, that he may indicate a right turn by extending his right hand and arm horizontally, which is safer than the system that was permitted before that and easier to recognize. Also, bicycles must now be equipped with a proper braking system. This enhances bicycle control and provides the police with the power to charge bicyclists who drive without proper brakes, because lack of brakes is a very real safety hazard. That a person walking a bicycle along a highway without sidewalks may walk on the right side of the highway not facing the traffic, provided it is unsafe for the person to cross the highway, is again a safety measure that I applaud. I agree that these new requirements will help make the bicycle safer to ride and more visible.

I think, in addition, we ought to be really encouraging municipalities to look at the provision of bicycle paths, not necessarily as a separate lane on a busy street, but as an alternative route. If we can begin to have throughout our cities routes that are designated as bicycle routes and where drivers will recognize that there are going to be more than the occasional bicycle, then that will contribute to drivers realizing that cyclists have a right to share the roads with them and put more of the onus on drivers to watch out for cyclists rather than constantly having it the cyclist who is worried about the car. This is an unequal contest if the two collide. I think there has to be some onus put on the driver to take responsibility for the way in which he drives with respect to cyclists.

Cycling is environmentally desirable. It cuts down on the pollution from automobiles. It cuts down on traffic congestion. It increases the livability of our cities if more of us can cycle, and it is interesting to see that over the last decade even our winter climate has not deterred many people who ride their bicycles downtown.

I certainly have no qualms in suggesting that bicycle couriers be required to wear helmets, and we should all perhaps be given safety protection from bicycle couriers and the way in which some of them ride. But at the very minimum, I have no hesitation in supporting the requirements that those riding bicycles as a commercial operation ought to be required to have the safety features, both of their bicycles and in their personal wearing of helmets.

I applaud the educational efforts that the member opposite has said are being undertaken by the government. I hope that we can perhaps see an evaluation of how those are working in the short term rather than in the long term, because I think education of pedestrians, drivers and cyclists will all contribute to the recognition that bicycling is a legitimate mode of travel

and one that we encourage and want to legitimize as much as possible.

Mr D. R. Cooke: Why don't you propose an amendment to the bill?

Mrs Grier: Why do I not propose an amendment to the bill?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs Grier: I am not sure that it is in order to suggest an amendment, but I think, on balance, what I am saying, as I toss around my arguments, is that I will support in principle the legislation that is before us today. I share with the member for London North the hope that this bill will be referred to committee and that the members on the government side will change their, unfortunately, recently adopted practice of requiring all members' bills to go to committee of the whole, which means that they are lost somewhere in the void of government, because they certainly never reappear. Those of us in the opposition, those in the public who wish to have them dealt with, have no opportunity of getting them on the agenda.

1030

If what I am hearing from the members opposite is that they think further discussion of this bill is required, then I would urge them to refer it to a committee so that the concerns and the reservations I have can be canvassed, so that people who have looked at this subject in greater depth and who have very legitimate suggestions to make about cycling can come before a committee and can share those concerns and ideas with us, because I think the principle of needing to assist people to protect themselves is one that I can certainly support. We have required seatbelts in cars, we have required carriers for automobiles for children rather than the rather flimsy things that certainly 30 years ago I put on my car seat to carry my children around. Perhaps it is, in fact, time that we make helmets mandatory, and discussion before a committee would give us an opportunity to canvass all of that.

I have also the concern that bicycle helmets are not cheap. Riding a bicycle is often something that people do out of economic necessity because they cannot afford to run a car. So I would hope that if we are going to make it mandatory, we would also look at some way of assisting people in acquiring the helmets. I know with child car seats, many non-profit organizations have arranged systems of networks where these expensive things can be shared and while you have an infant you can borrow or rent a car seat at a very low cost. Perhaps cycling helmets for children could be made available in the same way, so that as a child grows, you are not expending what is now a \$50 expenditure every time you need it.

Let me also say, while on the subject of cycling, that I have recently realized that there are not very many facilities around this building for cyclists. There is one bicycle rack on our premises. It is in the northwest quad. It is not very visible and many members of our staff who ride bicycles to work are reluctant to leave their bicycles there for fear of vandalism or theft. They also are reluctant to leave their bicycles out in the open air.

What I was saying, Mr Speaker, was that I hope in this discussion of cycling you might take note of the need on these premises for some edifice where bicycles could safely be left by those who ride them to work. There are a growing number of our staff who come to work by bicycle, and in the north wing there are many members of staff who have been driven to carry their bicycles up and put them in their offices or in the corridors

because they do not want to leave a valuable machine out in the elements or in a place where they fear that it may be tampered with. I hope that if the government is sincere in its desire to increase the safety and the viability of cycling, it will look to putting our own house in order, because I know that would be welcomed by many people.

In conclusion, let me say to the member for London North that I think I have argued myself into certainly supporting her bill in principle. I hope, as I say, that it can be referred to a committee, and I look forward to greater in-depth discussion at that time.

Mr Cousens: I am pleased to participate in this debate that has been brought forward because of the concern and interest that has been given by the member for London North.

Before I begin my remarks, this is my first opportunity to just comment on the magnificent efforts that have been taken by the member for London North in the very short time since this lady has entered the House, and certainly taken such an active role within the Ontario Conservative Party. She has given a tremendous amount of herself, in not only her thinking and her experience but just her commonsense approach to things. Through the electoral process to elect our new leader of the party on 12 May and for the many months of hard work and dedication, this is one person who will go down in the annals of the history of certainly our party and, I think, over the long term in the annals of the history of the Legislature of Ontario as one who is truly a dedicated, concerned Canadian and who puts others first, and certainly her Legislature and the people of the province at the head of the list. I begin with these words because I have not had a chance until now to publicly acknowledge the outstanding efforts that have been given by the member for London North.

I am really pleased to participate in this debate. I think it is another reason why we as legislators have to lead the way rather than follow. Very often we are in a position to say, "Well, what does the majority want to do?" Mr Speaker, you no longer participate actively in the Liberal Party, I am sure, because of your independence as a Speaker and the objectivity that you have, but for the rest of the Liberals who are in this House, the way they operate is by reading the polls.

They have probably been reading the polls and saying, "What should we do with regard to this legislation?" rather than being leaders. Instead of being proactive, they are reactive. The member for Norfolk wonders who the dinosaurs are in this world; they are certainly not on this side of the House.

I would like to touch on some of the reasons why people are not supporting Bill 166. I believe there are a number of reasons, some of them having to do with the fact that these helmets look funny by virtue of what in fact people are used to having on their heads. Who knows? I am not just saying members, but I know certainly when I said to some of the young people in my community, "Well, why don't you wear a helmet?" they said, "They look funny."

Mr Miller: My grandchildren wear all kinds of hats and they would likely be happy to put one on.

Mr Cousens: That is good. I wore a hat and it did other things to me.

The fact is, the honourable member is saying one thing now, but when it comes to voting time, he is not going to be supporting this legislation. To some people they look funny. I think the same kind of consideration went into it before people started wearing hockey helmets. They said, "Oh, they look funny," as if that was a reason not to wear a hockey helmet. Or if in fact it

seemed to be an inconvenience when they put a seatbelt on, it looked funny to have a seatbelt on. It just did not seem proper.

The fact of the matter is these helmets will save lives. It is one of the things that we can do to protect ourselves for the long term. Looks are not the important thing. What is important is that we have proper protection. It is that kind of protection that could really begin to make a change for someone's life, who, if he did not have that helmet, could have a fall and the damage could be permanent.

We often do not think enough about the permanency of head injury and the long-term effects it has. There are a number of young people I know who have had head injuries in car accidents and other ways. Their lives and their families' lives will never be the same as they could have been. Certainly it has had a long-term impact.

I do not think any kind of helmet—and this is the second reason I would give that people do not support the idea of the member for London North—is that they are not that comfortable. They will be hot on a summer's day. They will kind of slide around. The strapping may sort of change. You might have to stop your bike and readjust it periodically. You might have to stop and get rid of the sweat line. But the fact of the matter is, a lot of other things that we do for our own safety are not all that comfortable either, and yet if you really look at what it is going to do for you, that comfort factor is just a small consideration compared to the safety factor.

Some people say they do not work. I really begin to think they have not begun to understand how the Canadian Standards Association has made sure that these work. We are not talking about the design that came together in someone's kitchen. The strapping is now firm. We are talking about the protection on the head that can withstand a very large blow.

The Canadian Standards Association has approved two Canadian companies that manufacture bike helmets and two models have been approved by the Canadian Standards Association. We are now talking about a range of sizes. The Helmtec is a tour light model that ranges in size from very small. Denrich has another type of helmet that is also approved by the CSA, and it has sizes small, medium and large.

These helmets meet the standards of the Canadian Standards Association. Approval stickers will be visible on the helmet or the liner, so when people are purchasing a helmet they can see that it has gone through a testing process that allows people to know that what they are going to be buying really has been thoroughly and carefully tested.

1040

So when people say, "They don't work," I would have to say they do not know what they are talking about. We have a standards association in Canada which has gone through the testing process to see that it is okay.

One of the other reasons, the fourth reason, why maybe the helmets are not all that popular, is someone says, "Well, I didn't need it, so why should my kids need it?" That logic just does not hold any water when you start to consider the impact it can have.

I thought the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore spoke very eloquently when she spoke of her memories in Ireland, back in the last century or whenever it was, and the safety factors there.

Mrs Grier: I did not say the last century.

Mr Cousens: I am not sure, but back when the member was there. I really respect her wisdom that comes from her

years of experience. Certainly, we should all respect anyone who has been around that long.

One of the other concerns why people have not supported this in the past is that human rights are involved, and yet we have got around it. A turban cannot be an excuse for not wearing a motorcycle helmet. Motorcycle helmets are required, they are mandatory. They are there in the Highway Traffic Act for all people who want to drive a motorcycle. So if a person who has a concern because of his religion and has a turban, that does not take away the right of the law to be exercised on that person. If he is going to drive a motorcycle, he must wear a helmet. For anyone who has a human rights concern, I would say that does not take any kind of importance above safety. Safety would go first; and we have precedents for that in the legislation as it affects a motorcyclist.

There are many precedents where people have previously looked at this kind of legislation. The Highway Traffic Act in Manitoba has been amended, where it is now required that infant passengers on a bicycle must wear a helmet. This bill was recently proclaimed, on 19 March 1990. Another instance where there is a precedent for helmet usage on cycles is in Maryland, where they have a bylaw that has an effect on county roads and bicycle paths. It does not have an effect on state or federal roadways, but it would appear that there is now an effort, certainly in that state, to get things going.

I have not had a chance to follow research through into other states, but there is the beginning now of other jurisdictions saying "We are prepared to bring out progressive legislation that is going to have the long-term interests of people on our highways and our roads, and therefore there is an urgency to have something in place to have a helmet there."

It would appear that the ministry of the Ontario government has not done much research. Probably they are saying, "Well, it is not important because it has not been fully researched." The fact of the matter is, all the signs are coming in now that there has been research. Just one example that came across my desk was of a physiotherapist—I am rather sympathetic to physiotherapists; I am married to one and happen know that they deal an awful lot with people who are recovering from accidents and other situations. This lady, Martha Somerby in Thunder Bay, has completed a year-long study on the use of bicycle helmets. Her findings show a significant decrease in the incidence of severe head injury when a proper helmet is worn. Again, that is another example of research being done and I am sure there is a lot more happening that begins to say, "If you use the helmet, it is going to benefit you."

Is the Ontario Medical Association just sending out a request to municipalities across the province of Ontario suggesting that helmets be used because its members want to be good people? No. They are making the suggestion because they happen to know that you reduce the leading cause of injuries in young people by the use of helmets.

I guess another reason why people do not support this legislation has to do with the need to study it more; and that seems to have been the reason given by my good friend the member for Norfolk this morning, where in the Legislature he is saying, "Well, we need to still look at it more." This government keeps studying things to death and nothing is ever going to happen. They are going to call another quick election shortly and they will say "Well, we will study it again." They studied automobile insurance and look what we have got now; the more they studied it, the worse they did on it.

I am sure that if you take this as an example of their study ability as a government—not you as an individual, because

anyone with 14 grandchildren or thereabouts really has to understand what studying is all about; you have studied people for a long time. But studying this is just not a good enough excuse to say that you are not going to do something about it.

I believe the member for London North has done us a favour today in this Legislature. It is obvious that the government is not going to support this bill. They may come along and have a whip vote to vote against it. We never know what they are going to do, but what we are beginning to do is educate the people of the province of Ontario on the importance of having proper safety gear when they are doing different things. Certainly, if you are riding a bicycle there is a tremendous benefit to the rider, to a child that is being carried on a bicycle, to have the proper equipment. We require the bicycle to have brakes and other things on it. Why not protect the driver who cycles with such a thing as this? I think the member for London North is to be congratulated.

What we have to do now is to break down some of the prejudices that are part and parcel of the objection to helmets. By virtue of having a discussion on this, I would venture to say that among our pages, who are grades 7 and 8 young people—and I am not going to ask for a show of hands because that is not done in the Legislature and I know the rules well enough—there is not one who has a helmet; but maybe anyone who does could come and talk to me about it. I would hope that within a few years we are going to see more and more young people having helmets.

I truly respect the fact that it is something they need to be educated on. Everybody needs to be educated on it. Why not begin that process here in the Legislature? That is why I commend the honourable member for London North in bringing forward this bill to give us a chance to discuss it further.

Cycling is a more and more popular sport. More and more people are taking to the bicycle paths and the roads in the neighbourhoods on bicycles. Let us encourage that, but while they are doing it, we are going to see an increasing incidence of the possibility of accidents. Why not encourage people, if they are going to do a sport, to do it safely and do it right? Oftentimes the accidents are caused not because they are being foolish. An accident is an accident. Some of the worst accidents happen when someone runs into a parked car. They think the car is moving and, bam, they are into it. Suddenly, they are into an injury as well, and so damage is done.

I am seeing more and more people in my community wearing helmets. I see this as an example of them respecting themselves and taking care of themselves over the long term. All the excuses on why a helmet is not a good idea—it looks funny, it is hot and uncomfortable, it does not work, I have not done it before, I did not need to do it before and there is no precedence for it—all those to me do not make sense. The real thing that makes sense is that each one of us has to do more to protect ourselves, to protect our rights and by looking after oneself we are in a position to really have a long-term carriage for ourselves.

I would hope that the government will look at this bill. If it has to go to committee and it is amended there and changes are made to it, let us do that. But let us at least begin to be leaders in our community and in government by having some way in which we can do it.

Mr Reyecraft: I am pleased to participate in this debate this morning, and I want to compliment the member for London North for having introduced Bill 166 and having it placed before the Legislature.

Bill 166 provides us with an opportunity to focus public attention on the very important issue of bicycle safety and on one way in which we can reduce the number of serious injuries that result from bicycle accidents. Every year in this province there are thousands of accidents involving bicycles. The member for London North sent a letter to all members of the Legislature indicating that in 1987 there were 5,000 bicycle accidents in the province. I assume that refers to the number of reported accidents in the province, because I suspect the number is much, much larger than that.

Whatever the number is, many of those accidents involve serious injuries and some of them involve death. One thing that is certain is that some of those serious injuries and some of those deaths could have been avoided if the bicycle rider had been wearing a proper helmet. Many of the people in this province who ride bicycles are unaware of the statistics on accidents and serious injuries and deaths. Many of them are simply not aware of the risk they are taking when they attempt to ride a bicycle without a proper helmet.

1050

I did some consultation on this bill last evening. I phoned my resident expert on the subject, my 14-year-old son, Nathan, who is in grade 9 at the high school in Glencoe, and I asked him how many of the students at the elementary school that he graduated from last year wore helmets when they rode bicycles. He indicated that none did. I asked him how many of his fellow students at Glencoe District High School wore helmets when they rode bicycles. Again, he said that none of them did. I asked him how many adults he had seen wearing helmets when they rode bicycles in the village of Glencoe where we live. Again, he indicated that he had seen none. The only helmets that he has seen on people on bicycles are the helmets on babies or young children who are being carried as passengers on bicycles.

I suspect that the situation in Glencoe is not unique or unusual. I suspect that similar situations exist in most small towns and most rural parts of this province. The use of helmets by cyclists in those places is very limited. Certainly, in large urban areas like Toronto, even like London, the use of helmets by cyclists has increased significantly in the last few years. One needs only to look around to know that, but the risk exists everywhere. Accidents do occur in those small towns and rural areas just as they do in the large cities. Riders are seriously injured in bicycle accidents in those places and some of them, unfortunately, are killed. There is no doubt that the use of helmets would make cycling safer, not just in heavy city traffic but wherever people ride bicycles.

I support the wider use of helmets by cyclists and I also support the recent amendments to the Highway Traffic Act, which will make it safer for people who ride bicycles, and I compliment the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore for her involvement in those legislated changes.

Let's get to Bill 166, which has been proposed by the member for London North. Bill 166 would make it mandatory for anyone riding a bicycle on a highway to wear an approved helmet and would also make it mandatory for children who are being carried as passengers on bicycles on a highway to wear those helmets. Just to clarify things, the Highway Traffic Act defines "highway" as including "a common and public highway, street, avenue, parkway, driveway, square, place, bridge, viaduct or trestle." We are talking about all public roads.

The Highway Traffic Act establishes a penalty for those who do not observe its provisions and in the case of section 88, which Bill 166 would amend, the penalty there is a minimum of

\$60 or a maximum of \$500, not the lesser amount as I believe was stated by the member for London North. That means anyone riding a bicycle on a public road without a helmet would be subject to a fine of from \$60 to \$500.

A lot of the people who ride bicycles in this province are younger than 12 years old. I suspect that half of the people who ride bicycles in this province are younger than 12 years of age. Under the Provincial Offences Act of the province, people under the age of 12 cannot have charges laid against them. As a result of that, the provisions of the Provincial Offences Act, half of the people who would be affected by this legislation would not be subject to its enforcement. That means we would have obvious violations of the legislation but a police force that would be powerless to enforce it. In my view, that makes Bill 166 impractical.

Some might suggest the law should be changed so that charges could be laid against kids who are under the age of 12. I think that is problematic as well. First of all, I do not think \$60 to \$500 fines against nine-year-olds or 10-year-olds are appropriate. I also think there is a real problem in trying to collect those fines should the violators decide they did not want to pay them. With infractions involving automobiles and other vehicles, because they are licensed there is a mechanism whereby those fines can be collected. But bicycles are not licensed so there is no mechanism to allow for the collection of those fines.

I think, too, this legislation might encourage kids who are riding bicycles to get off the highway, to get off the public road and on to the sidewalk. That is problematic as well, certainly for pedestrians, particularly seniors. They do not like to see young people riding bicycles on sidewalks and many municipalities in the province have passed bylaws that prohibit that.

There is another problem with the legislation, as the member for London North herself has pointed out, in that there are only two bicycle helmets that are now approved for use in the province by the Canadian Standards Association. That is pretty limited. I understand they have tested some 10 helmets that are now available and of those 10 only the two were viewed as being acceptable. There are also problems with the costs of the helmet and the implication of that cost on the people who would be affected.

The final point I want to make is that I think there is a better way. I think the use of helmets by cyclists is increasing, particularly in urban areas but all across the province. There is much more we can do to educate bicycle riders on the value of wearing approved helmets. I think we should do that. We should continue to promote and educate but not legislate. Encouraging the greater use of helmets by cyclists is something that is very practical; I believe Bill 166 is not.

Mrs Cunningham: Is it appropriate, if there is time available to the official opposition party, that I use that time?

The Speaker: Is there agreement that the member for London North may use the two and a half minutes plus her own two minutes?

Agreed to.

Mrs Cunningham: I will use this time to respond specifically to any questions as I have written them down. I would like to thank my colleague the member for Markham and my colleague the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore for their support, for their questions and of course for their very positive attitude

towards having this bill referred to committee so that we could look at making it work.

I think the time has come when we have to lead the way. These statistics are not new. Many of them have been gathered throughout the 1960s, the 1970s and more recently throughout the 1980s in Ontario. The injuries are becoming greater, not less, and it is time to do something about it.

I would say to the member for Norfolk I was not surprised to hear that the ministry officials are not happy with this piece of legislation. They were not happy with the legislation around the wearing of helmets when it was introduced for motorcycles and they certainly were not happy with the legislation for seat-belts.

Mr Miller: We supported that.

Mrs Cunningham: We supported it, but not with the support of the administration. Of course they are warning us as politicians that there are difficulties with legislation and certainly, as the member for Middlesex has pointed out, with whether or not one can fine them appropriately. I believe we have the opportunity right now to refer this to committee and all of us hear about what these problems from the administration are all about.

This is the wrong time to defeat a piece of legislation that is certainly worthy of more discussion. I will say to the member for Middlesex that those numbers I used for fines were numbers that were used for pedestrians. We do have the opportunity to amend this section and say section 2 instead of section 1. We could make it a separate section in committee. We could say there would be warnings. We could say whatever we want to say if we want to make it work.

We know that in the Highway Traffic Act itself there are ranges available of both sentences and fines. All we have to do is make the fine suit the breaking of the law and make it work. In this section, when we talk about pedestrians, and I wanted to talk about motorcyclists to wear the helmet, the member is quite right to say that "every person who contravenes any provision of subsection (1) is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to a fine of not less than \$100 and not more than \$500." I was aware of that. Let's call this a new section and make the fine or the warning different. But I certainly think that at this time in the province of Ontario we have a wonderful opportunity to lead the way. To use fines and enforcement as an excuse is just not acceptable to young people across the province. They are prepared to lead the way.

1100

When we talk about helmets, yes, the Canadian Standards Association has in fact approved two new helmets in the last two years and when I first raised this they had not approved any. But you have to remember at the same time that the American Standards Association, of course, has many helmets that have been approved and they have been used in the province of Ontario and across Canada for many years, so we do not have to go with those two. But we know also that the Canadian-owned-and-operated Helmtec and the samples of these sports-safe helmets have helped in the awareness of the importance of wearing helmets. They in fact have given out coupons under certain circumstances so that people can get \$5 and \$10 off. They have worked with the Ontario Medical Association.

If we really want something to work, we can make it work. That is what I am here to say today. The time has come in Ontario. We have shown the way; we have led the way.

Manitoba has in its way. Other states, and I used Maryland as an example today, have led the way, and we have an opportunity. Everyone in this House agrees that head injuries caused by bicycle accidents, and especially more severe ones, and all of them by young people who do not wear helmets, are a real problem. I would just like to ask for the support of the House with regard to this matter.

NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANTS

Mr Miclash moved resolution 52:

That, in the opinion of this House, recognizing that fully accessible, quality health care for every Ontarian is a priority of this government and that northern Ontario residents often have to travel outside their communities to receive specialized health care services and that travel costs in northern Ontario are higher on average than in other areas of the province and that some situations, regardless of age, require the assistance of a travel companion, the government of Ontario should reduce the distance criteria under the northern travel grant program from 250 kilometres to 200 kilometres and that any individual requiring the assistance of a travel companion regardless of their age be eligible to receive a grant to cover their companion's costs.

Mr Miclash: It gives me great pleasure to rise in the Legislature today to bring forth this private member's resolution, which deals with an issue of great importance to the people not only in my riding but to all northern Ontario residents. The issue is, of course, the provision of health care for northern Ontario residents.

The geography of Ontario has much to offer. We know that it is a vast geography and it provides for a flourishing tourist industry and has many benefits of natural resources across it. But as well, it does have some drawbacks. We know that the geography of northern Ontario, for example, is one of vastness. We know that distances between centres in the north are large, causing a remoteness not only among themselves but also from the larger urban centres of southern Ontario. As a result, the delivery of health care services faces daunting challenges for us in the north.

When the present government came to power in 1985, it made a commitment to alleviate this problem. One of the first actions it took was to implement the northern health travel grant as part of its strategy to ensure that all Ontarians have access to adequate health services. There are other programs also which are available to help northerners. We know that social assistance will provide funding for people who cannot afford travel to get specialized services.

Just last week, actually, the government announced another priority in terms of helping people in the north practise in the north and be educated in the north, and it was an initiative that drew 48 training positions into the north. We know that both Lakehead University and Laurentian University were allotted 24 positions each to bring practising physicians into the north, just one program that has been offered by this government along with many others which try to provide health care in the north.

We know that there is an underserviced specialist program which allows specialists to move in and out of some of the communities that do not have these specialized services, and we know that these services are provided in the communities to the people who need them and that they are best suited to provide them in their home communities.

But let me return to the northern health travel grant. We know this provides coverage for residents of various territories

across the north and it allows them money to be used to travel for specialized services. To date, the grant program has been of assistance to 150,000 individuals and we have had some 15,000 travel companions use the grant system as well. Undoubtedly this has been a great benefit to patients in northern Ontario.

When the program was first introduced in December 1985, the minimum distance at that time was 300 kilometres. In 1988 we saw a reduction in that minimum distance to 250 kilometres. That is saying that the distance to travel to a centre for specialized services had been reduced in 1988, but today I have indicated that that reduction may not have been enough. I know of a great number of communities, including three major ones in my riding, that are between the 250- and 200-kilometre range, and we know that transportation over that distance can be quite expensive.

Last year the minister undertook a comprehensive study to take a look at the program and came up with a number of recommendations. They sent out a review team composed of people from the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Northern Development to take a look at the program. In order to achieve a wide public response, the team mailed out some 300 questionnaires. As well, they included people who had both used the grant system and who had been refused a grant under the program. The purpose of the study was to find out whether people were satisfied with the program and what kind of comments they would have in terms of the program. I understand that generally they received fairly favourable comments about the program and about the specialist care that was able to be provided through the program.

I know that the Ministry of Health at the present time is going over the recommendations, and today I bring forth this resolution to let it know about some of the concerns of both myself and my constituents about the program in the Kenora riding and across the north. The provincial government has moved in the past five years in a very responsible manner to address the problems that exist and I feel it has shown a willingness to listen to us there in the north.

I would just like to give a few examples of some of the problems that we have encountered in the Kenora riding, some of the problems that have come forth from constituents of mine. I would like to refer to a young man who had injured his hand and had to travel on a weekly basis for some 13 weeks to Winnipeg to receive treatment. As I indicated before, he was from Keewatin and the travel grant program did not cover his travel for those 13 visits.

As well, I would like to highlight some cases to demonstrate my point in terms of the benefit of a travel companion under this program. One case that was brought to my attention was that the wife of a gentleman from northwestern Ontario had been referred to a specialist in southern Ontario for open-heart surgery. Both doctors who had examined the patient had recommended a travel companion. However, as the patient was over 18 years of age, this was denied.

As well, a young lady who had been travelling to a specialist in southern Ontario since she was 14 had the assistance of her parents up until the time that she turned 18. Of course at that point, again, the assistance to the companion by the travel grant was discontinued. As well, we have heard from a blind man from Red Lake, a town in my riding, who was travelling to Winnipeg and again denied the travel assistance program.

1110

So you can see, Mr Speaker, that we can see complications in this program where companions are needed to travel and, the person being over 18, he is not allowed to take the companion along.

There are other reasons that dictate the need for a travel companion, such as medical condition, disorientation due to disease or treatment, or actually the need for moral support of the patient. We know that often the trauma of dealing with a medical condition calls for special care and some special care that can be provided by a companion in travel.

Removing the age restriction could also save money and make our health care system in northern Ontario more efficient. I refer to patients who sometimes, instead of taking an ambulance from centre to centre, could be accompanied by a travel companion and alleviate that very expensive need.

I suggest that the delivery of health care is to ultimately be able to expand medical service in the north through higher technology and more specialists, but in the meantime I think there is a gap, a gap that must be filled, and I feel that the northern health travel grant program has obviously filled this gap and has been of great assistance to us in the north.

I indicated earlier that the government has moved quickly in meeting many of the medical needs in northern Ontario, but unfortunately some people are still falling through the cracks. Therefore, after reviewing the northern health travel grant and reviewing what it is doing for the people in northern Ontario, I have proposed that the government of the day reduce the distance criteria under the northern health travel grant, as I indicated earlier, from 250 kilometres to 200 kilometres.

As well, I mentioned a number of cases where it was obvious that individuals were in need of companions to travel out of their centres to major centres where they would receive specialized medical care treatment, so I have also indicated that I feel we should be taking a look at any individual who requires the assistance of a travel companion, regardless of age, that he be eligible to receive a grant to cover the companion's cost.

As you can see, Mr Speaker, I have indicated two ways that I feel we can take another good look at the travel grant program in northern Ontario and ensure that it helps meet the needs of people who must travel to other areas of the province or even into Manitoba to receive these specialized treatments and the specialized care that they need.

Mr Hampton: I am very pleased to be able to take part in this debate, because my constituency is right next door to the member for Kenora's, so he and I have experienced many of the same bureaucratic hassles with the northern health travel grant. In fact, I can even recite a few more, and I would, just for the benefit of making the record complete.

The bureaucracy that is involved with the northern health travel grant is even more absurd than the member for Kenora suggests. Let me give an example that I encountered. If you live in northwestern Ontario, the northern health travel grant allows you to travel either to a centre like Thunder Bay or Toronto in Ontario for service, or allows you to travel to Winnipeg. However, if your doctor sends you to Winnipeg you have to be very, very careful that the doctor you are going to see in Winnipeg has all of these neat little letters after his or her name and is in fact recognized as a specialist by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, because if he or she does not have all of these neat little letters after his or her name, even though you receive specialist services from him or her in Winnipeg, you may not qualify for the northern health travel grant.

Let me give members an instant example. Dr Jerry Wilson in Winnipeg is one of the most renowned knee and orthopaedic surgeons in the world. He is the consultative doctor for the Winnipeg Jets hockey team. They have hockey players they have invested \$1 million in and they are very concerned about their knees, so they send them to Dr Wilson.

When people in my constituency are referred to Dr Wilson for surgery or for specialist attention, they go, under the impression that they can recover northern health travel grant funding for the travel. When they get back, the Ministry of Health tells them: "No, no, Dr Jerry Wilson, even though he is recognized around the world as a leading orthopaedic surgeon, does not have all of the necessary little initials after his name. You don't qualify for the northern health travel grant."

How ridiculously absurd and stupid, that someone who is recognized around the world as providing specialist services, the Ministry of Health in Ontario will not recognize him.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Hampton: That is just one example.

What is at stake here is a fundamental principle of medicare within Canada. Medicare states that recognized health services should be, shall be, universally available. Whether you are rich or poor, old or young, disabled or abled, health services should be available to you.

What has happened in northern Ontario is this: You have to be wealthy, or you have to be able to acquire some money from someone, either through charity or through a loan or service group, because in many cases you are in fact cut off from health services. That is the fundamental of it.

I want to give credit to the member for Kenora, because he deals with one small aspect of this problem, but the fact of the matter is that the situation goes much beyond what his resolution is dealing with. People from all across northern Ontario are put into situations where, as I said, they have to deny necessities for their family in order to get medical care because their travel costs are not fully covered or even partially covered, which to me goes completely contrary to the principles of medicare, and I would argue, therefore, completely contrary to the principles of OHIP.

I just want to show again the double standard. When local health care services were not available for cancer patients from Toronto, the Ministry of Health paid the full bill to send them to Thunder Bay, to Windsor, to Ottawa. Our information is that something close to 500 patients from Metro Toronto and area received full costs of return air fare, full costs of hotel accommodation, taxis, meals and so on. Not only that, but escorts also received this funding.

None of that happens for people in northwestern Ontario or northern Ontario. You have to beg and plead for an escort. The maximum you can receive is \$250, even if the cost of going to see a specialist in Toronto or Winnipeg runs into the thousands when you take into account air fare and hotel accommodation.

There is a great inequity here. While I give credit to the member for Kenora for bringing a small piece of this forward, it is only a small piece. Under this government that inequity has continued, and it is getting worse. So while I say to him this is a small piece, it is not nearly enough.

Mr Eves: It is a pleasure for me to rise and partake in this debate here this morning. I will be supporting the member for Kenora's resolution, but I must say that I am doing so partially—not only because I believe that his resolution is a

worthwhile one, but if I had my preference, I would be going even further than he is going, for reasons that I am about to explain.

The distances for eligibility for the northern health travel grant program are outlined in regulations and there are two different distances. There is travel within northern Ontario, or in the case of the Kenora area of the province to the province of Manitoba, and this distance was changed from 300 kilometres to 250 kilometres on 1 April 1987. I am sure that most members will be aware that the northern health travel grant program was announced in December 1985 by the Minister of Health.

1120

There is also another regulation with respect to travel from northern Ontario to other parts of Ontario, namely, southern Ontario. That distance still remains at 300 kilometres. I note that the member for Kenora's resolution does nothing to address that distance in his resolution.

The northern health travel grant program has long been an issue of concern for me because of the problems it creates for my constituents. As I said, the then Minister of Health, the member for Bruce, created the program in December 1985. Specifically excluded from the program was the district of Parry Sound and everything in the district of Nipissing east and south of North Bay.

On 1 April 1987, as I said, the minister changed the distance eligibility requirements for travel within northern Ontario from 300 kilometres to 250 kilometres. The district of Parry Sound, despite my pleadings, was still not included because at that time it did not have northern status. For those unfamiliar with the Parry Sound riding, it includes the entire district of Parry Sound and literally everything in Nipissing district east and south of North Bay, which includes all of Algonquin Provincial Park among other areas of the district of Nipissing.

At that particular time, before northern status was granted, and now—it still exists—there is the ridiculous situation where there are people who reside in the Nipissing portion of my riding who live farther south than many residents in the Parry Sound district part of my riding. They qualify for northern health travel grants because they live farther south, and the people who live farther north in the district of Parry Sound do not qualify. It does not make any sense to me whatsoever and it is causing tremendous hardship, literally, for hundreds of my constituents.

On two separate occasions in this Legislature I have brought forth private members' resolutions calling on the government to uniformly designate Parry Sound district and all of Nipissing district to be recognized by all ministries in the government as being part of northern Ontario. I did that on 25 June 1987 and almost a year later on 28 April 1988. Both of my private member's resolutions received unanimous consent of this Legislature.

I have continually raised this issue in questions, members' statements, I have gone to estimates for the Ministry of Northern Development when the Premier was the acting Minister of Northern Development and finally on 9 June 1988 an announcement was made where northern status was given to Parry Sound riding, being all of the district of Parry Sound and all of the district of Nipissing.

In making this announcement, the Minister of Northern Development, the member for Cochrane North, stated, and I quote so there can be no doubt as to what the government's intention was on 9 June 1988:

"The government has acknowledged that the people of Parry Sound and Nipissing share the special social and economic needs of northern Ontario and that they deserve access to the special government programs established to address them. Official inclusion in northern Ontario will give individuals, institutions, municipalities and organizations access to specific programs oriented to northern needs."

At that time the government made a commitment to the people of Parry Sound riding that on 1 April 1989 the entire area of Parry Sound and Nipissing would be considered part of northern Ontario. They would have access to all programs oriented to the needs of northern Ontarians. The government must live up to its commitment to the residents of Parry Sound riding. Despite northern status for Parry Sound riding, some 75% to 80% of its constituents are still ineligible for the northern health travel grant program because the distance requirement of 300 kilometres for travel from northern Ontario to southern Ontario for medical treatment does not include the residents in Parry Sound riding.

I would suggest, as I have suggested to the Minister of Northern Development, the Minister of Health and the Premier on many occasions, and again I am doing it here this morning, if there is any validity to the commitment that the Minister for Northern Development made, that that distance be changed from 300 kilometres to 200 kilometres as well as the change that my friend the member for Kenora is making on behalf of his constituents, which I fully support, I might add.

My constituents have another problem, and that is because another part of the regulation specifically defines what territorial districts are northern Ontario for the purposes of this program. It specifically excludes the district of Parry Sound and it specifically excludes the part of Nipissing that lies east and south of North Bay, ie, the Algonquin part of the district of Nipissing. That regulation has to be changed as well if the government is going to give any meaning whatsoever to the commitment that it made to the residents of Parry Sound riding.

I have the ridiculous situation where many residents of mine who must travel to Toronto for medical treatment, a lot of whom are cancer patients to Princess Margaret Hospital, do not qualify for the northern health travel grant program, despite the fact that this government claims that Parry Sound riding now has northern status. It is a sad, sad joke for the people of Parry Sound riding. I think it is about time that this important issue was addressed in a sincere and forthright manner by the Minister of Health, the Minister of Northern Development and the Premier.

When I queried the Minister of Northern Development about this, he said, "If I do it for you, I am going to have to do it for the people of Kenora." Well, I challenge him to do it for both. Not only should this private member's resolution be addressed and adopted by the entire Legislature, but also the changes should be made to those distances so that my constituents as well can benefit from the northern health travel grant program.

When I asked the Minister of Health about it, she said it is not a northern program. The northern health travel grant program is not a northern program? Do people in Windsor qualify? She claims it is based only on distance and not whether you are in northern Ontario. She has told me that several times. She has written me letters saying that.

I cannot believe anybody could be so ridiculous and represent the Ministry of Health in cabinet and not know that the northern health travel grant program, which defines northern Ontario as certain territorial districts in northern Ontario, is indeed a northern program for northerners. Maybe she should go

up past Highway 7 once in a while and realize that she will not fall off the end of the earth and that another world does exist out there. I find that absolutely ridiculous.

I suspect the real reason is that it will cost money and that the government does not want to live up to its commitment. To show how ridiculous this really is, the officials at OHIP in Kingston have been holding on file since 1 April 1989, the day that we were supposed to become part of northern Ontario, applications for the northern health travel grant program, because they fully expected that their minister would be directing them to process these applications and give the people in Parry Sound and Nipissing districts the northern status that they justifiably deserve.

I will be supporting, as I said, the member for Kenora's resolution. I would also urge the government to address the issue and the concern that I have expressed here today for all residents in Parry Sound riding as well.

Mr Kozyra: It gives me great pleasure to stand and also indicate my support for this resolution from my colleague the member for Kenora. I believe it is an excellent resolution that takes a look at a program that has had outstanding success and looks at ways of further improving it.

The program's success speaks for itself. In the years 1988 and 1989 alone, 55,000 patients and over 3,000 companions were helped and assisted through this northern health travel program. The member for Kenora addresses two distinct points that do need improvement: the reduction in distance criteria, one of his proposals, and the companion eligibility that would increase the access to this by companions, no matter what age, and certainly age should not be a barrier in this.

1130

So while we recognize on the one hand the success of the program, which speaks for itself—in the four and a half years almost 150,000 people have taken advantage of it—I am a little disturbed that the member for Rainy River from the official opposition took the opportunity not to praise the benefits but once again, in overanxiety to discredit the government, to mix apples and oranges, to talk about the northern health travel program but cloud the issue by mixing into it the program being administered by the cancer society under totally different funding and totally different criteria.

Mr Pouliot: Sick people are sick people.

Miss Martel: It just shows the inequities between north and south, Taras.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Kozyra: The deliberate fuzzy thinking to cloud the issue—

Mr Wildman: There is no way that the cancer society should be having to contribute money to chauffeur people around this province.

Mr Kozyra: They fail to recognize—

Mr Pouliot: That is a cheap shot, a cheap shot. A sick person is a sick person.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Kozyra: The truth hurts, Mr Speaker.

Mr Pouliot: A buck is a buck. A sick person is a sick person.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Le député de lac Nipigon, s'il vous plaît. If members want to have an opinion,

they can choose their own time to make it. Please, standing orders.

Mr Pouliot: I came here seeking—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr Kozyra: The truth of the matter is, as the Minister of Health explained, that whether the person is travelling from Kenora to Toronto, Thunder Bay to Toronto or, as in the latter case that sparked the issue, Toronto to Thunder Bay, the support from the cancer society remains the same. There is no special treatment as the members from the opposition party have tried to make out.

Mr Wildman: They shouldn't have to pay for it.

Miss Martel: How come we don't get full costs when we go to the south, Taras? How come we don't get full costs when we have to travel to the south?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please, la députée de Sudbury-Est.

Mr Kozyra: It was a deliberate attempt to discredit this other program by mixing these medical apples and oranges. This program, the northern health travel grant, is a very good program. There are points for improvement, but we are addressing those.

On a more personal note, I had an opportunity seven years ago to experience some of the inadequacies of northern health care. At that time I was more physically active and involved in a northern Ontario broomball provincial tournament. At that time, when on a breakaway early in the morning—I think it was an 8 am game—I dove for the ball, the goalie dove with his broom for my teeth and knocked in three of them substantially and cracked one so that the bottom portion fell off. Here we were in Hornepayne, a small northern community 300 miles from Thunder Bay, and I went in search of proper health care.

By this time it was 9 in the morning, a cold winter morning. I found a wonderful dental clinic, but it was closed. When I asked about it, they said, "Well, we built this clinic to attract medical people, but as yet we have been unsuccessful." Hopefully now, seven years later, they have been successful, but there is a case of the dental aspect. I then went to the medical facility, a doctor. They said, "Yes, there will be a doctor here"—this was 9 am—"but he will be here at 12 and you are 18th on the list." I thought my situation was rather critical, so I decided to drive back to Thunder Bay, a six-hour drive. I did not have a companion, so I drove alone and got attention there. But that was my experience with the inadequacies of northern health care.

Mr Wildman: Getting good health care in the north is like pulling teeth.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Kozyra: One of the arguments used is that maybe we should not improve this package—I have heard this used and it is faulty logic again—because it deters health improvements in the north. Because it is making it so easy to have access to specialists in the south, maybe it will just take care of our pressing need in the north. I would like to speak against that. The government's record in continuous improvement—and granted, I will be the first to say there is room for improvement and that is why it is a gradual process, but we are moving in the right direction.

There was a recent announcement in Thunder Bay of the residency program that will eventually incorporate 48 medical doctors, family practitioners, as residents in the north, with the basically solid idea that if they work in northern communities, there is a greater likelihood they will stay there. Most people who have been in the north for a little while appreciate it and do decide to stay there. I think this is an excellent program, a big step in the right direction.

About six months ago in Armstrong a clinic was opened. A large amount of funds came from the Northern Development ministry, but in addition, that clinic replaced a little tin shack, one of these mobile trailers, that up to that point had been the temporary and permanent kind of medical facility. Thunder Bay recently got announcements of \$3 million for a cancer unit expansion and to help in the operating, and soon will get \$1.5 million for an improved, expanded perinatal unit.

This does not take away from the concerns we have. We know that part of the problem in the north is not the lack of total number of doctors in Ontario, but it is a distribution problem. We have to continue to strive to improve this so that the north gets its fair share. Especially, we do have a critical problem in specialists, which is in an ongoing concern. But that does not take away from the validity of what the member for Kenora has put forth in his resolution.

I must say the other reason I am somewhat disappointed with the members of the official opposition in their attack on this, to give fair credit, is that it was one of their members, my predecessor for Port Arthur, Jim Foulds, who was one of the driving forces for this excellent program, and I give recognition for that. I think they should be speaking well of the program rather than harping and carping on picky little points.

Mr Pouliot: I too would like to commend the member for Kenora. It is not a courageous move. It is a private member's resolution. It is a piecemeal way of addressing problems, but I remind myself and my distinguished colleagues that every journey starts with a single step. In some cases it starts with a very, very small step. It is a policy of gradualism; it is a policy that is incremental. At this rate we shall never get there.

If someone is sick in Thunder Bay and is referred to a specialist by the family practitioner and asked to go and seek services in Toronto, the minimum air fare costs \$464. What the ministry will pay is a maximum of \$300. So that person, he or she, is already \$164 behind the eight ball. Supplementary is the cost associated with lost wages, meals and accommodation, so you are looking at around \$1,000 to pay a specialist in Toronto the compliment of your visit.

If you have a sickness and if you live in Dryden, you are looking at \$618. That is the minimum air fare. You cannot take the train. Forget about Via. They forgot about us. With Greyhound you will never get there. In this case, if you are in Dryden, \$350 is the maximum you will ever get. You lose your wages. You have no accommodation. You are over \$300 in terms of air fare alone. I have a great deal of concern.

Mr Speaker, you will recall vividly the case of the 38-year-old blind person from Red Rock who was referred to an ophthalmologist in Winnipeg. Because of his condition, because of his difficult trip, he requested the service of a companion, an escort to help him make the trip. The blind person's application for an escort, believe it or not, was turned down.

Ironically, by a twist of fate, a 17-year-old hockey player in the neighbouring community, fully six feet tall, the picture of health and some talent, sprained an ankle—it was after hours—was sent to Thunder Bay and was given the opportunity to have an escort, the reason being that if you are 18 years of age and

you sprain your ankle at a hockey game, well, you bring your escort. Rightly so. There is the human dimension; they will pay. But if you are 38 years of age in this Ontario of ours in 1990 and you are blind, you do not have the right to have an escort because there is no provision.

1140

On that basis, I salute and applaud the efforts of the member for Kenora because he too recognizes, "Let's correct a situation that has been allowed to go on for far, far too long." The member is giving us a drop and, if not an ocean, certainly the recognition factor has to be there: People shall not be penalized by virtue, on account of, because they are less fortunate because they are sick.

Mr McLean: I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words in support of this resolution. It is related to the Ontario health care system. I would like to read the resolution again just to familiarize some of the members who have just come in. As they are no doubt aware, this resolution states:

"Recognizing that fully accessible, quality health care for every Ontarian is a priority of this government and that northern Ontario residents often have to travel outside their communities to receive specialized health care services and that travel costs in northern Ontario are higher on average than in other areas of the province and that some situations, regardless of age, require the assistance of a travel companion, the government of Ontario should reduce the distance criteria under the northern travel grant program from 250 km to 200 km and that any individual requiring the assistance of a travel companion regardless of their age be eligible to receive a grant to cover their companion's costs."

I believe the people of northern Ontario should have easy access to a full line of quality, specialized health care service. They have the right to have fully accessible health care in the north, just as every resident in central and southern Ontario has the right to these services. Perhaps the hospitals that already exist in Sudbury and Thunder Bay could be the regional health care facilities that offer specialized health care services and a full line of medical equipment that is currently found only in southern Ontario.

This could mean that patients requiring hospitalization and specialized treatment would not have to travel such great distances, thereby cutting down some of the costs. Failing this, I am in complete agreement with the idea of reducing the distance criteria in the northern travel grant program and providing a grant to cover a travel companion's costs. Travelling can be a traumatic experience and we should make this experience as pleasant as possible. If that means providing a grant for a travel companion, then so be it.

Mr Speaker, you will note that I agree with this resolution in principle, but I have some serious doubts when the member for Kenora includes the phrase "recognizing that fully accessible, quality health care for every Ontarian is a priority of this government." We all know this is simply not the truth. We know this is not true, because the deterioration of Ontario's health care system demonstrates once again the failure of both the Premier and his Minister of Health to manage this province's health care system. For instance, the day before the last election was called in 1987, the former Minister of Health promised \$30 million for the development of Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital. That was three years ago. To date, no one has seen that \$30 million, and we do not anticipate seeing it for a while, if ever.

Another example occurred during the election campaign three years ago. The Premier declared that, if elected, his government would allocate \$850 million for 40,400 new acute and chronic care beds in Ontario, but his Minister of Health admitted last year that only 300 of those promised beds would be in place by the 1990 target date—failure all along the line in the health care system.

My constituents in Simcoe East are just as concerned about the state of our health care as I am. More than 500 of my constituents felt so strongly about this issue that they took the time to complete and return my spring questionnaire. Of those who responded, 60% indicated that the state of health care in Ontario has worsened, 33% indicated there was no change and 7% said it was improved. As well, 35% indicated that the Health minister should place a greater emphasis on providing more home care, 30% said more outpatient services are required, 25% said we need more hospital beds and 10% said the nursing home beds are their priority.

This is an indication of what the people of Simcoe East are saying, and I think it is a pretty clear reflection of what the people of Ontario are also saying, but this government continues to do nothing. I am afraid that if this situation continues, the government will still be just providing lipservice to us all.

It is hard to believe why this member was so adamant about bringing this bill forward. Why could it not be changed in a regulation? Why could the minister not make the announcement to have it changed? Why not have a voting bill before this Legislature that, if it were passed, would save many, many lives in this province? The government does not see fit to bring that bill forward. Do members think the government is going to see fit to bring this resolution to a conclusion that would be satisfactory to those people in the north? The health travel grant in Ontario has been so important over the years that it must be continued and expanded upon.

There was no need of this resolution; the government could have done it without it.

Mr Campbell: I am pleased to rise to support my colleague for Kenora because I know of his very strong concern for the kinds of programs, the kinds of medical problems that we have in the north. Before I was here, I was pleased, as the chairman of health and social services committee of the region of Sudbury, to have supported through our regional council a resolution for precisely this kind of program. I am pleased to have seen it evolve and continue on, but I want to deal with some of the problems that we felt we were going to have in the program. We felt that a program such as this would more clearly cause patients to overfly Sudbury. Part of our strategy in Sudbury, of course, was to have a very excellent medical centre for northeastern Ontario, and we have gone a long way to achieving that in a number of specialties.

But to demonstrate that there are still people being referred to other facilities outside of northern Ontario I refer to the Ombudsman's report in the case of Mr K. Mr K, a resident of northern Ontario, was referred to a specialist in a city in southern Ontario in order to undergo open heart surgery. Due to his precarious health situation and upon the advice of his general physician and specialist, Mr K's wife accompanied him to southern Ontario for the surgery. Mrs K's application for a companion travel grant was denied because her husband is over the age of 18.

The key to that whole phrase was "southern Ontario," when Sudbury has one of the most magnificent centres for cardiovascular specialties in Ontario—not just in northern Ontario, but in Ontario. I am pleased that we do have such an excellent special-

ty, but still people are being referred to southern Ontario. I am concerned about that. I think that, along with these kinds of evolutionary steps, we can in fact have that recognized, that some specialties are still overflying the very excellent centres we have in northern Ontario.

Along that vein, I am very much concerned that my colleague for Rainy River would ask that perhaps—and I do not say, in that case, the knee surgeon. I am sure the knee surgeon is a specialist and I am sure that he is well recognized, but then it opens the way to people with unproven treatments in other areas to be funded. Where do you draw the line?

I know in northern Ontario, certainly, there a number of orthopods who are highly qualified and who can provide specialties, so I would ask that sometimes when we are dealing with this issue that we recognize the fact.

I think, as well, that it is a good program to have, certainly the companion grants to this point, and I would hope that the member for Kenora is successful in making the change for companions to travel because I think it is important for the patient's wellbeing. A number of physicians would recognize that and in fact would recommend it.

1150

One small point of course that constantly bothers northerners, and it is a little bit of an aside but related, is that when you fill out the form to get the money, the northern health travel grant address is PO Box 1292, Kingston. Now, I think it should be in northern Ontario, and our government has announced more jobs that are going to be decentralized in the budget program. The budget has announced that a number of these kinds of offices are going to be diversified throughout the province. My good friend the member for Kingston and the Islands, I know, would understand that having this office in the north, having it acceptable to people to receive that funding faster because of the mail service, the wide geography and everything else—it is somewhat difficult.

I do have more to say, but I know that my friend the member for Kenora would like an opportunity to wrap up and I appreciate the fact that I have been able to participate in this debate.

Miss Martel: In crass political terms, the best I can say is, this is a joke. I have been here for two and one half years; the member for Kenora, the member for Sudbury and the member for Port Arthur have been here for two and one half years, and in that whole time, this grant has been wholly, totally, absolutely inadequate and this government has not done a bloody thing to change it.

When the questions were raised—the questions about the blind gentleman from Red Lake, the questions about residents who live in Atikokan and have to travel over to Thunder Bay and cannot get their costs covered—it has been people in this party who have raised those questions, not the Liberal backbenchers. They have not been seen. The silence has been deafening from these members. As a matter of fact, the only reason we are seeing this now—

Interjections.

Mr Campbell: It is our government that brought it in.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Ballinger: He started this.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Durham-York.

Mr Pouliot: You guys never raised those social issues. You don't have a social conscience.

Le Vice-Président : Le député de lac Nipigon, n'est même pas dans son fauteuil. La députée de Sudbury-Est, s'il vous plaît.

Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, I would like some of that time back, if you do not mind. Can I get that?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Miss Martel: Okay, let me keep going then. The real reason we are seeing this now is that we have an election in a few months. In crass political terms, this is a chance by some of the northern New Democrats to try to get some support. We have been here for two and one half years. It is your Liberal minister who is in power, your government that is in power. If you were serious, you would have made some changes.

The Deputy Speaker: The member seems to forget to address the Speaker.

Miss Martel: All right, Mr Speaker. Let me tell the House what the grant does not do. As a matter of fact, my colleague has referred to the maximum amounts of travel. Let's just give it to you from Sudbury, Mr Speaker. The airfare is \$314.20. The most that we can get back is \$125.

If you go by Via Rail, you have to go at night, so you have to take a sleeper. The minimum amount of cost for a sleeper from Toronto to Sudbury is \$188, so you still are not getting the full cost covered. It goes back from Toronto to Sudbury at night again, so you have to take another sleeper back and the minimum cost again is \$188.

If you have an appointment in Toronto on Friday, you have to take the train down Thursday night, pay for a sleeper, and then pay for hotel accommodation in Toronto on Friday night because you cannot get home until Saturday. That is totally inadequate and this government has done nothing to resolve that.

The full fare of all of the cost for people to travel should be covered. That way northern Ontario people would be assured that they will have full access to health care like those people in southern Ontario.

My colleague the member for Lake Nipigon has already talked about no accommodation costs being covered. When people come from northern Ontario, if they are old, fragile, sick or young kids, they have to bring their mother or a parent or some companion with them. Those costs are not covered and we all know how expensive it is in Toronto to find any accommodation.

The full cost of wages, compensation for salary for a man who has to bring his young daughter or his elderly mother down is not covered. Those are the kinds of costs that should be covered, and if this government was serious about it, this resolution would have gone a lot farther and dealt with all of those problems that have been ongoing for at least two and one half years.

The problem with health care in northern Ontario is the Liberal government, because it does not want to admit that there are inequities and it does not want to address the real problem.

The Deputy Speaker: Do other members wish to participate in the debate?

Mr Wildman: In the few seconds left, I want to say that the problem we have is that we have a Ministry of Health that does not really understand the north.

Recently, I wrote to the Minister of Health pointing out two problems: the fact that the northern travel grant does not cover the full air fare from Sault Ste Marie to Toronto and also the fact that, with the changes in air service in Sault Ste Marie, there are no longer any commercial aircraft that can take wheelchairs on board.

In response, the Minister of Health wrote back to me and went to great length to talk about the fact that a disabled person could travel Via Rail or could take the Ontario Northland Railway. Who wrote the letter? There is no Via service and no Ontario Northland service in Sault Ste Marie. I suppose they could travel to Kapuskasing from Sault Ste Marie and take Ontario Northland or something.

The fact is that when my friend the former member for Port Arthur introduced the resolution calling for this kind of a program, he saw it as a stopgap, as something that could be done as a Band-Aid until we got better services in the north. Unfortunately, this government continues to treat the whole health care system as a Band-Aid, with piecemeal approaches rather than taking a comprehensive approach to ensuring that we have the facilities and the training facilities that we need in order to get the services we need in the north.

It is not enough to continue piecemeal changing this program. We have to have proper health care for all northerners to have access.

The Deputy Speaker: Government members have two more minutes to debate. The member for Kenora has two minutes, but there are another two minutes to the debate. Do you want to use the two extra minutes? You have four minutes then.

Mr Miclash: First of all, I would like to thank the members for participating in this debate this morning.

When we take a look at the members from the opposition, they concentrate very carefully on the northern health travel grant program. In my opening statement, I indicated this is one of many programs offered to people of the north. I talked about the expanding services that I am going to be involved in tomorrow, actually, at the Lake of the Woods District Hospital for the expansion of various services. I talked about the travelling specialist program and I talked about a great number of things. The northern health grant program, and the travel assistance that is provided, is only one of many of these programs, programs that they obviously have forgotten about in determining this.

The member for Lake Nipigon indicated that it is only a small step in the direction of improving this particular program. I think it is a step that is crucial in helping out our people in the north. However small he may see it, I still think it a crucial one.

We talked earlier about the balance of allowing people to travel from the north for specialized service and of getting specialized service into the north. I think this is a very delicate balance that we have to take a look at, one that the Ministry of Health concentrates on, one that it looked at in terms of having the specialists come in to the north.

The members fail to note that just recently the Premier was in Thunder Bay and announced that we are going to have 48 positions in two universities in northern Ontario that will bring people to the north to practice.

As the member for Port Arthur indicated earlier, we quite often get people up to the north who determine that want to remain as part of the north. I would just like to say that these, along with a great number of initiatives that this government has taken, are things we are doing to ensure that the people of

northern Ontario are receiving the best possible health care today.

It is unfortunate that the members from the official opposition would take exception that I mentioned a person from Red Lake, a person in my riding. I feel it is unfortunate that they would suggest that I had not brought that to the attention of the minister, for the reason that I brought it here today to the House, to let people know that there are deficiencies in the programs. One of the main deficiencies that I pointed out was in terms of companion travel; again, one of the reasons that I bring forth this resolution to the members of the House today. So, again I would just like to thank the various members who have put forth their view and I look forward to carrying on with this resolution.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Revenue and the member for Lake Nipigon, I call both of you to order. This completes the debate on Mr Miclash's resolution.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

The Deputy Speaker: Mrs Cunningham has moved second reading of Bill 166.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

That vote will be deferred until later.

NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANTS

The Deputy Speaker: Mr Miclash has moved resolution 52.

Motion agreed to.

1204

The House divided on Mrs Cunningham's motion for second reading of Bill 166, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes—21

Bryden, Carrothers, Charlton, Cousens, Cunningham, Daigeler, Eves, Farnan, Grier, Hampton, Hošek, LeBourdais, Mackenzie, Martel, Morin-Strom, Owen, Pollock, Pouliot, Ray, M. C., Roberts, Stoner.

Nays—18

Ballinger, Brown, Campbell, Elliot, Epp, Faubert, Keyes, Mancini, Mahoney, McGuigan, Miclash, Miller, Nixon, J. B., Oddie Munro, Polsinelli, Poole, Reyecraft, Velshi.

The Deputy Speaker: According to the standing orders, the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

Mrs Cunningham: Mr Speaker, could we have it in the standing committee on general government? There were a lot of discussions during the debate and I feel we would do a much better job with the legislation if we have an opportunity to look at it there.

Hon Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, we would like the bill to follow its natural process, the usual process that takes place in the House, and we will support your original suggestion.

The Deputy Speaker: In that case, we will have a count because I need the majority.

The House divided on Mrs Cunningham's motion to refer Bill 166 to the standing committee on general government, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes 13; nays 25.

The Deputy Speaker: The bill will be referred to the committee of the whole House.

The House recessed at 1210.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The House resumed at 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr Farnan: The truckers of Ontario are suffering because this Liberal government permits American truckers to enjoy an unfair competitive advantage. American truckers, as a result of deregulation, can now haul goods within Canada while Canadians do not always have the same opportunity within the United States.

Furthermore, with the exception of Michigan, Ontario has the most lenient weight control limits in Canada and the United States. Yet despite this fact, our fine for exceeding this generous gross vehicle and load weight is a ridiculous \$53.75. Compare this to the situation in the United States. The same truck that pays Ontario's token fine would pay \$2,250 in Pennsylvania and \$10,000 in Rhode Island. The American truckers simply view our petty fines for overloading as the cost of doing business.

Certainly overloading will contribute to our \$1.8-billion road repair bill this year. Overloading is a danger to safety on our highways and overloading with our low fines gives the American truckers yet another competitive edge as they move goods within Canada.

The trucking industry is a vital component of the Waterloo region's economy. It has been badly undermined by this Liberal government's deregulation policy. Ontario's truckers must have a level playing field. Otherwise jobs will be lost and trucking companies will move south of the border. It is time to act. Truckers deserve better.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr Runciman: More than eight months have passed since social workers in the town of Prescott identified several children who had become victims of sexual abuse. After these many months, 28 of the 36 children identified have received no psychological treatment whatsoever. The Ministry of Community and Social Services acted quickly to provide funds to assist with the prosecution of those charged, but the ministry has not provided one cent to permit this urgent treatment to begin.

A local task force has reported to the ministry that almost \$1 million in funding is required to provide the necessary treatment over the next two years. More important, the majority of the 36 abused children suffered physical injuries as a result of their sexual abuse. This and other factors establish this group of children as among the most severely traumatized. Therefore, they require the most skilled and comprehensive treatment services available, and it will be long-term.

Only one facility exists in the Prescott area which provides specialized treatment for children and it has a waiting list of almost 150. Local social service agencies are understaffed and the many cases of sexual abuse now identified present a unique and difficult problem for the community of Prescott.

I urge the Minister of Community and Social Services to take immediate action to provide the necessary funding so that these victims of child abuse can receive the treatment and counselling they so urgently require.

WILLIAM J. TEGGART

Mr Mahoney: I would like to bring to members' attention the upcoming retirement of Peel region's chief of police, William J. Teggart.

The Peel Regional Police Force has the reputation of being one of the most advanced forces in North America in the area of criminal investigation. Chief Teggart distinguished himself in this field as well, and one of his cases was the very well known Demeter murder investigation. He spent 20 years in the detective branch, holding virtually every rank up to and including deputy chief.

Over his 34-year career as a police officer Bill has received many awards, including the Governor General's Canadian 30-Year Police Exemplary Service Medal and the Queen's Silver Jubilee Medal for Community Service. He also received, for the Peel Regional Police Force, the Ontario Medal for Police Bravery from the Premier of Ontario.

Chief Teggart has always believed that police officers should pursue higher education and as such he studied police-related subjects at the Ontario Police College, the Canadian Police College, Northwestern University, the University of Toronto and the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy.

I was in attendance recently at his farewell dinner and it was evident that he is a very well-respected man. It was a wonderful evening with great humour and yet some sadness in saying goodbye.

I wish Bill and his wife Joan much happiness and success in future years and I am sure the residents of Peel would join me in well-deserved congratulations to this outstanding gentleman of the Peel Regional Police Force.

TIMOTHY GARLAND

Mr Kormos: Down in Niagara where I come from, the people are mad as hell that there is a convicted paedophile who is going to be released in 20 days ready to strike again, ready to attack more children. Of course, we are talking about 27-year-old Timothy Garland of Brampton, whom members heard about yesterday. Children are going to be victimized and this government shows such disinterest in the inevitability of that.

This molester has been neither treated nor controlled by virtue of the courts and the probation process that followed his sentence. He is identified as being dangerous and having an uncontrollable sex drive. Indeed, in his prison cell they found a list of future victims and descriptions of the sort of atrocities he was going to impose on those children.

It is incredible that a creep like this is going to be allowed to walk the streets to prey on more youngsters. What is more incredible is that the government shows such a lack of concern about the fact that there are going to be more and more victims, not just from other molesters but certainly, as I said, predictably from this Timothy Garland.

The response of the government to questioning yesterday was pathetic. It showed not just a complete lack of concern, but obviously lack of ability to do anything to intervene in these types of tragic circumstances—tragic for the victims. One need not be so concerned for the perpetrator. When will this government start acting responsibly?

LONG-TERM CARE

Mrs Cunningham: I would like to take this opportunity to make a few comments on the government's long-term-care report released yesterday. While we in the Progressive Conservative Party are pleased that this report has been released, I feel obliged to express some concerns.

Many of the reform policies in the report were part of the 1986 paper entitled *A New Agenda*, released four years ago. The new service access agencies referred to are reminiscent of the one-stop access program which has not yet been implemented in the pilot centres.

The government must also address the high turnover rate in the labour supply. Without an adequate labour supply long-term care services will not be available. I would also like to caution the government from offloading too much on to the municipalities.

I am particularly disappointed that the report omits regulation of rest homes. The government has been aware for some time now that many elderly citizens have been living in sub-standard care because no legislation exists to protect the residents. It is appalling that the government has done absolutely nothing to ensure a standard of safety and care in these facilities where abuse, neglect, poor nutrition and hygiene have been reported.

It is important that we do not lose sight of providing quality long-term care services. Clients' needs and preferences must remain at the forefront of this process. We will watch the implementation and continue to press for good recommendations and implementation.

1340

SUDBURY LAND RECLAMATION

Mr Campbell: Last week I had the pleasure of representing the Minister of Northern Development at the planting of the millionth tree in the land reclamation program for the regional municipality of Sudbury. Such an event was not envisioned several years ago when a core group of concerned citizens took realistic stock of the region's environment and said, "We must do something to enhance the vitality and the beauty of the region of Sudbury," I say to my colleagues across the way.

Scientists, led by Dr Keith Winterhalder of Laurentian University and Dr Tom Peters of Inco, researched and experimented with planting methods and types of grass and trees that would grow in the soil of the once barren rock. The result is the greening of Sudbury. Over the last 12 years, 2,900 hectares have been reclaimed over the last 12 years, including land across the transportation corridors into Sudbury.

I am proud of the province's commitment to the land reclamation program through the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines. By the end of the province's current agreement with the regional municipality, the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines will have contributed a total of \$843,000 over a 12-year period. Approximately \$10 million has been committed to this program with other financial contributions, including those from the regional municipality of Sudbury, Inco, Falconbridge, and the federal Department of Employment and Immigration.

The land reclamation program serves as an excellent example of the confidence, commitment and the high level of co-operation demonstrated by municipal leaders and others in the Sudbury community.

SOFT-DRINK CONTAINERS

Mrs Grier: For some time I have been urging the Minister of the Environment to get serious about waste reduction by requiring soft-drink containers to be refillable. I have received many calls and letters supporting my position. I want to share with the House a letter which a Mr Sweeney wrote to the minister. It says:

"As a small store owner, I was disappointed to learn of your decision to allow pop companies to introduce more non-returnable containers.

"Before the 500 ml non-returnable bottles were put on the market, our store used to return over 300 small bottles every two weeks. We now see these bottles in our neighbour's gardens, our garbage can and probably in school garbage cans.

"You mentioned that if people wanted returnable bottles, they would buy them....The most popular sizes....are no longer available in returnable containers.

"You said that people from all over have praised our blue box system....It is a good program, but that doesn't mean that we have to manufacture material to fill them. What about the praise we received from the New York officials with regard to our bottle deposit system....They used our bottle-free highways in their argument to get their present deposit system.

"If you must allow the industry to use non-refillable bottles and cans, make them charge a deposit.

"As a store owner, this would mean extra work for me but it's a small price to pay for a better future for my children and their children."

Mr Sweeney is quite right. I hope the minister will listen to what he has to say and act on it. The minister ought to; Mr Sweeney's store is in St Catharines.

FARM TAX REBATE

Mr McCague: In 1989 the Liberal government unilaterally changed the farm tax rebate program without consulting the farming community. They income-tested a property tax matter.

The program was initiated in 1970 as a way to redress farmers for the disproportionate taxation of farm assets. Farmers continued to pay taxes on their homes. In 1989 the Liberals turned the program into an income subsidy program and cut \$23 million from the budget. Only after he announced the changes did the Premier promise to consult with farmers to reform the program. The farm tax rebate program review committee has now reported to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. The committee clearly supports the position of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture that the program should be based on "the agricultural use of the property, not on ownership status, occupation of the owner, or income level of the owner."

We have heard from the Ontario farmers and from agricultural experts. They have concluded the government's moves were wrong and should be reversed to bring back the original principles of the farm tax rebate program; that is, to relieve farmers of an unfair property tax burden.

The Progressive Conservative caucus opposed the Liberal move in 1989. We now call on the government to immediately implement the recommendations of the committee.

SEATBELTS

Mr Owen: Most motorists in Ontario wear their seatbelts. The majority believe that wearing a seatbelt reduces the chance of serious injury in the event of an accident, and statistics bear this out.

A 1987 Ontario road safety report found that 86% of drivers were reported to be wearing seatbelts when involved in crashes, and of these a majority, 82%, were not injured. However, those drivers not wearing seatbelts when the collision occurred were 21 times more likely to be killed and 76 times more likely to be hospitalized than belted drivers.

Improved road safety habits, including the use of seatbelts, would help reduce injuries and in turn reduce costs associated with hospitalization and insurance.

A group of teachers at Georgian College in Barrie, Michael Wolfe, Fred Ruemper, Tony Podzienski and David Aves, was one of six groups to receive highway safety research grants from the Ministry of Transportation in 1989. Recently they had an opportunity to share their findings at a Toronto conference. Ultimately the findings of these research groups can be applied to encouraging better and safer driving habits and conditions.

I am pleased that these Georgian College teachers were given the opportunity to turn their talents and concerns to this problem and to lead the way to better highway safety across the province of Ontario.

VISITORS

The Speaker: Just before we go on to the next order of business, I would like to inform the members that we have a number of visitors in the Speaker's gallery today, including seven members of a delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The delegation is headed by the Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, USSR Supreme Soviet, Rafik Nishanov. Also accompanying the delegation is the ambassador of the USSR in Canada, His Excellency Alexei Rodionov.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

SENIORS' MONTH

MOIS DES PERSONNES ÂGÉES

Hon Mr Morin: This year marks the 20th consecutive year that the government of Ontario has proclaimed the month of June as Senior Citizens' Month in Ontario, a time to recognize both the past accomplishments and the continued and valued contributions of the more than one million senior citizens living in this province.

Cette année, le thème du Mois des personnes âgées, JubilAGeTion/Fête-Âge, en hommage aux personnes âgées, symbolise l'esprit de participation et de réjouissance qui anime de nombreux événements dans des centaines de communautés de l'Ontario. Parmi les événements qui prendront l'affiche, il y aura «JubilAGeTions of June», une série de spectacles de variété qui donneront aux personnes âgées de l'Ontario l'occasion de démontrer leurs nombreux talents.

This year's Seniors' Month theme, A Celebration of Age, symbolizes the spirit of activities and events that will be taking place in hundreds of communities across Ontario. One of the special events happening in June will be a series of seniors' variety shows, JubilAGeTions of June, featuring the many talents of seniors.

The best acts from across Ontario will appear at a special four-day song, dance, comedy and music extravaganza at Roy Thomson Hall, 13 to 16 August. The highlight of the province's tribute to seniors will take place this evening at 6:30 pm in the main foyer of the Legislative Building when the Honourable Lincoln M. Alexander, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, presents a number of seniors with an Ontario Senior Achievement Award.

1350

The purpose of these awards is to recognize some of the outstanding contributions individual seniors have made to their communities during their senior years. This year, the external nomination process resulted in over 600 nominations being received by the Office for Senior Citizens' Affairs. With the assistance of Mrs JoAnne Fillmore, chair of the Ontario Advisory Council on Senior Citizens, and my colleagues the member for Wellington and the member for Oshawa, a number of seniors will be presented with the 1990 Ontario Senior Achievement Award.

Chaque récipiendaire honoré ce soir témoigne de la contribution inestimable des personnes âgées à nos communautés. En rendant hommage à ces personnes, le gouvernement de l'Ontario témoigne sa reconnaissance et sa gratitude à ceux qui continuent de mettre leurs talents et leur énergie au service des autres. Au cours du Mois des personnes âgées, nous félicitons toutes les personnes âgées qui continuent de partager avec les autres leur temps et leur sagesse.

Each of the award recipients to be honoured this evening exemplifies the tremendous contribution older adults make to our communities. Through honouring these few individuals, the government of Ontario expresses its recognition and appreciation to those who continue to use their talents and energies for the benefit of others. During Seniors' Month we applaud all seniors who continue to give generously of their wisdom and time.

I hope that each of the members will join me in this tribute to Ontario's seniors by recognizing the many contributions seniors make to the quality of life in their area and by celebrating this very special month-long celebration of age in their community.

RESPONSES

SENIORS' MONTH

Mr Farnan: I and the New Democratic Party want to join in recognizing the contribution of seniors to this province, the wealth of experience they bring and their generosity in terms of volunteerism, etc.

However, in recognizing seniors and in calling for jubilation and music extravaganzas, I have one suggestion to make to the minister and to the government: If they truly want to recognize seniors, meet their promises. In 1985 the government said to seniors, "We are going to give you denticare." In 1987 it said to seniors, "We are going to give you denticare."

The reality of the matter is, if the government really wants to recognize seniors, to recognize the contribution they have made to society, then it would be nice if it did it in a practical, tangible, concrete way. Let us say to the minister, "Seniors were out there when the government made these promises." Telling them there is going to be jubilation, telling them there is going to be music extravaganza, is fine. We want to recognize them, but for goodness' sake recognize them in a practical, tangible, concrete way by giving them the kinds of services they truly need.

I have called upon this government several times now to introduce denticare. It is about time it acted upon it and in this month of seniors add to the jubilation, add to the musical extravaganza, do something practical; come forward and produce the legislation that will give denticare to seniors.

Mrs Cunningham: It is with a great deal of pleasure that we respond with some significant jubilation to the celebration of Seniors' Month in Ontario.

We owe our seniors a lot. They have been our role models and they have been the people who have worked hard to make our province what it is, and those of us who have been elected to the Legislative Assembly will try to keep up their standards that they have set for us. In so doing, many of them have come, with age, to need some services that we in this province hope that we can maintain and make even more available to them.

I would say at this time that I am happy the minister will be presenting the awards this evening at the Legislative Assembly to those seniors who have made significant contributions over the last few years. I will be part of the awards ceremony, as someone from London will be receiving the award.

I should say that during this month we have a wonderful opportunity to make further announcements to this House and to the public of Ontario. Perhaps we will see some rest home regulations. We could take our pick. How about a response to the Lowy report on the overuse of medication with our seniors? We did talk about, and have talked about for the last four years, an advocate for seniors. We will be looking for that. The integrated homemaker program: In the last election there were some 18 locations across the province of Ontario. This year there are still only 18 locations. We will be looking for some improvements there. My colleague from the New Democratic Party has already mentioned the need for dental care for seniors.

We are looking for funding policies, and have been for the last three years, that recognize the needs of seniors in nursing homes and homes for the aged so that we can take a look at care in both those facilities being properly remunerated so that no one is suffering because of where he or she is sent because of a waiting list.

The one-stop access: This was part of A New Agenda, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to hold it up, because my predecessor, a member of the Liberal party, Ron Van Horne, was the initiator of this report, for which we will be forever grateful. The Strategies for Change, which was tabled in the House yesterday, were somewhat disappointing because we are still getting more discussion and not enough action.

We are here in this opposition in this wonderful democracy we have in Ontario to help the Minister of Community and Social Services and the minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs, to urge the minister along and get the Treasurer and the Premier to respond appropriately to the services that have been so long needed.

In closing, I will say that as we went across the province of Ontario in the last four months, community by community by community was saying: "We want services in our homes. We don't want to be in hospital beds if we don't need to be there."

We wish the minister the very best. We in the opposition parties will continue to raise these issues on behalf of seniors in the House and we compliment him for his announcement today.

Mr J. M. Johnson: I would like to compliment the minister for continuing this program that has been in existence for 20 years. I sat on the committee and I was very impressed with the number of excellent presentations that were made on behalf of nearly 600 seniors in this province. It is extremely worth while to realize that we have so many dedicated people, and especially our senior citizens, who are participating so actively in the life of this province.

I look forward to this evening so I can review the 1990 Ontario Senior Achievement Award recipients, the ones who

took so long for us to determine that they indeed were the best, because it was a selection of a very few out of many hundreds and many others could have received this same definition of being an achiever.

So I do congratulate the minister. I encourage him to carry on the program and I guess, if I have to be political in one sense, I am going to ask him once more to zero in on that accessibility fund and provide elevators for senior citizens' apartment buildings in this province.

ORAL QUESTIONS

RESIGNATION OF CABINET MINISTER

Mr B. Rae: I had hoped the Premier would be here today, but in the absence of the Premier and of the Deputy Premier, who I had also hoped would be here today, I will have to go to the Attorney General.

Interjections.

Mr B. Rae: No, it is the Attorney General I want to ask this question of because of his particular knowledge of law, and indeed of life.

We had yesterday two quite different accounts of the circumstances surrounding the resignation of the Minister of Culture and Communications, one from the Premier and one from the minister. The former minister has yet to make a statement to the House.

It would appear from what the Premier said yesterday that what was a case of bad judgement on the part of the minister was the fact that she asked for assistance from certain companies which had been doing business or would potentially be affected by her work as a minister. I want to ask the Attorney General first of all if he understands that the Premier's account of events is the case, rather than the statement of the minister. Could he confirm that for us?

Hon Mr Scott: I have only read accounts of the scrums in the press and was present—

1400

Mr Wildman: You were in the scrum yourself. You were on TV yourself.

Hon Mr Scott: Just relax, honourable member for Algoma.

I have read the press accounts and I was present in the House for the question period yesterday. I do not accept the premise of the leader's question. I got the impression that both the resignation letter of the minister and the comment of the Premier indicated that an error of judgement, in the Premier's expression, though not anything illegal, had occurred in the manner in which the nominating campaign of the minister involved the use of representatives or employees of clients of the ministry.

Mr B. Rae: Does this mean that the new rule which the Premier has apparently enunciated applies only to ministers who are affected by races that are internal to the Liberal Party? Does it mean that only when there are complaints from other candidates from within the Liberal Party is there a problem?

We have raised on a number of occasions examples where ministers of the crown—the former Minister of Health had letters sent out on his behalf to all kinds of health service organizations and to various doctors who were all encouraged to come to a cocktail party. It is well known that there are lawyers

who contribute to the riding organization of the Attorney General, as well as others, I am sure.

What I want to find out is, what are the rules now? Exactly what are the rules and how are they being applied? Is it now the rule that a minister of the crown is not allowed to accept funds from organizations with which his ministry does business? Is that the new enunciation of the rule from the Premier of the province?

Hon Mr Scott: I do not think, in answer to the question, that what happened yesterday means any of those things. I think it is perhaps to be drawn from yesterday's experience that the standards the Premier has imposed in respect of organizing campaigns for nomination might well—but probably will not—be applied by the opposition parties as well.

Mr B. Rae: It is in order to find out what that rule is and whether we are only talking about a problem within the Liberal Party or whether we are talking about a problem when the Liberal Party is running against other parties. We are entitled to find out what the rule is.

Garth Drabinsky and Phil Lind both sent out a letter on 23 March 1990 on behalf of Christine Hart, which letter apparently went unobserved by the Premier, saying: "In her short time as minister, Christine has brought a fresh and innovative approach to Ontario's cultural life. She has also added greatly to the current debates in the fast-changing world of communications."

What I want to find out is why something is a problem at the end of May when it was not a problem at the end of March. Exactly what is the morality that is being applied here? Is it only being applied—

The Speaker: Order. You asked the question.

Hon Mr Scott: The honourable member will want to recognize that the Minister of Culture and Communications was not caught. She acted on her own, as she said yesterday. I noted in this morning's paper that the honourable Leader of the Oper—Opposition—I should have said "the operation"—the Leader of the Opposition had asserted that this appeared to be a matter of trivial concern and he was astounded that the Premier would require the resignation. The fact is, if the honourable minister had not resigned, she would have been hounded from office after pestering by this opposition, as others have been before.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr B. Rae: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Yes, if I can hear.

Mr B. Rae: The Attorney General stated a position on my part which is completely false, completely the opposite of what I said in this place and what I said outside, so I would appreciate—

The Speaker: Thank you. Order.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I have to say that I allowed that question. I have a little difficulty still in seeing how that pertains to the Attorney General's ministry.

TIRE DUMPS

Mrs Grier: All this week I had planned to ask questions to the Minister of the Environment on waste reduction. The minister has only been here for two out of four days, so I would like today to ask a question on the same subject, indirectly, to the Solicitor General.

I am sure the Solicitor General will remember that after the enormous tire fire in Hagersville he and the Minister of the Environment scrambled to explain why they had failed to prevent this fire from happening. In fact, on 15 March, after the fire, the Solicitor General and the Minister of the Environment announced with their usual fanfare that they were going to bring in tougher fire prevention and environmental protection legislation to make sure it could not happen again. To quote the Solicitor General, he said, "This government stands firm in its resolve to put measures in place to prevent another fire of this type in Ontario."

I managed to get a private member's bill in to do what I suspect the Minister of the Environment would not do, on 22 March.

Can the Solicitor General explain why, two months and more after that brave announcement, we have seen no legislation to amend the fire code from the Solicitor General?

Hon Mr Offer: I would like to thank the honourable member for acknowledging the announcement and the direction in which it took place. I think that she was being quite charitable, as I recall, yesterday dealing with this government's initiative in the environment field and I am glad that she is carrying on in that direction today.

I indicated at that time that we felt it was necessary that there should be amendments, not only to the fire code dealing with its regulations, but also dealing with the responsibilities of the fire marshal or his designate, dealing with inspections and with the ability to make certain that any contraventions are to be complied with immediately when there is the threat or the consequence of a particular fire.

We stand by that commitment. We are working now on the regulations to the fire code, as per our commitment. We are currently working on the amendments to the Fire Marshals Act. Again, in accordance with our commitment given, we are working to make certain that that particular responsibility, which we said we would give to the fire marshal, as per our announcement, is in fact given.

Mr Mackenzie: The key to the Mount Hope disaster waiting to happen is that the owner, Mr Musitano, has received instructions from the local fire marshal to do certain things. The fire marshal has indicated clearly to Mr Musitano that he is not in compliance with these instructions, with the fire code and with the regulations under the Fire Marshals Act. The fire marshal is not taking any further action because he is waiting for the Solicitor General's promised amendments to the fire code to be passed. The fire marshal is hesitant to move without more specific sections under the fire code on tire dumps, which we understand are part of the amendments. Does this not make the minister the person directly responsible for no action being taken in this case?

Hon Mr Offer: I think that the member of the opposition has forgotten to indicate that immediately upon that announcement, we have moved and it has already happened that those particular tire dumps, first, have been inspected across the province, that we have categorized all of the tire dumps, that we have secured all of the tire dumps, that we have moved to safeguard the particular tire dumps, that we have also indicated

that we will be making changes to the fire code dealing with regulations surrounding the piling of tires in dumps and that we are also amending the Fire Marshals Act to give to the fire marshal and his designate the ability to make certain that contraventions are complied with when there is a serious consequence of fire. We have made that commitment, we have acted on the safeguarding of those particular tire dumps and we are going to be bringing in those amendments and regulations.

1410

Mrs Grier: They have not acted, as my colleague the member for Hamilton East says. If they had acted, we would have seen the legislation that had been promised and we would have some much greater assurance that Hagersville could not happen again. That is what the Solicitor General said he wanted to make sure happened. There is a real danger that it could happen in Mount Hope, and if he thinks the security and the guard dogs are going to prevent a tire fire, then he is dreaming. We do not know who is paying for the security guards and the security that he says is in place; we suspect it is the taxpayers, not the owners of the dump site.

There are now four weeks left in this session. What we want to know from the Solicitor General is when will we see the legislation and will it be a priority so that we get it through this House as soon as possible and do not have another tire fire?

Hon Mr Offer: I wish to assure the honourable member and all members of the Legislature that this is indeed a priority, not only with my ministry and the Ministry of the Environment but with the government, dealing with the strengthening of the Fire Marshals Act, dealing with the strengthening of the regulations under the act known as the fire code. We are working on those particular regulations. We are working on amendments to the Fire Marshals Act to give to the fire marshal the type of power necessary to make certain that any contravention of the code, where there is a serious consequence of fire, is in fact acted upon. We made that commitment, we are working on that and we will act upon that.

RESIGNATION OF CABINET MINISTER

Mr Runciman: In view of the absence of the Premier, the absence of the Deputy Premier, the absence of the new Minister of Culture and Communications, the absence of the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet and the absence of any respect for legislative accountability, I am forced to put my question to the government House leader.

In the Premier's own words yesterday, the former Minister of Culture and Communications showed bad judgement because she accepted help in her nomination bid from representatives of companies involved in an upcoming regulatory hearing. As members know, there are many inconsistencies surrounding the resignation; the Premier says one thing, the former minister says another. The Premier says the member for York East personally asked for help on the campaign from Cantel, and the member for York East says that she did not solicit help. The member for York East says she offered her resignation and the Premier says he asked for it.

When we talk about bad judgement, we can reflect back on the former Minister of Energy and the president of Unicorp organizing a fund-raiser. That was bad judgement, but he was not required to resign.

Can the minister assure this House and the people of Ontario that we have been given the whole story on this resignation?

Hon Mr Ward: I believe that both the Premier and the former minister have given a full explanation of the circumstances surrounding the resignation.

Mr Runciman: Today I have been given some information which would lead us to understand that at last week's cabinet meeting a former Minister of Culture and Communications put forward a document recommending the government support wide-open competition for long-distance service. I wonder whether the minister is prepared today in the House to confirm if indeed that presentation took place, was a decision made, and if yes, was the minister involved.

Hon Mr Ward: No, I am not prepared to give any indication.

Mr Runciman: This is a very serious matter, as I am sure the minister can appreciate, despite his smile. In the light of yesterday's events, I would put this forward to him. Is the government of Ontario going to accept the document written by the member for York East or will it withdraw the document from cabinet and re-examine the issues so that all parties involved may be assured that the position of the Ontario government has not been improperly or unduly influenced by this minister's actions?

Hon Mr Ward: As I indicated in my previous response, I am not prepared to deny or confirm any matters that were before cabinet.

PREMIER'S COUNCIL

Mrs Cunningham: In view of the absence of the Premier, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. The Premier's Council was established with great fanfare in the 22 April 1986 speech from the throne. This 28-member, blue-ribbon panel chaired by the Premier is composed of a number of cabinet ministers and key players in the business, labour and academic communities.

The Premier's Council has a very specific mandate: to steer Ontario into the forefront of economic leadership and technological innovation. The council set out to fulfil its mandate in three easy steps, of which all of Ontario has been very watchful: examine the state of the Ontario economy objectively; determine how to enhance the province's strengths while addressing its weaknesses; and based on the findings, develop policies and proposals for the province's future.

Perhaps the minister could provide us with an update on the work of the Premier's Council.

Hon Mr Kwinter: I do not think the Speaker would allow me the time to tell all of the things the Premier's Council has done.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Kwinter: Do we have unanimous consent? I would be happy to spend some time talking about it.

The Premier's Council, as I am sure all members will know, has been diligently working and has produced documents that have been acclaimed internationally as to their efficacy, relevance and insight.

I assume that in supplementary questions the member will ask me about reports in the media and I will be happy to wait for that particular question.

Mrs Cunningham: The minister is certainly on top of my style of doing business. Quite frankly, I am going to ask him about a report in the Toronto Star, not just because it appeared in the Star, but because many of us know members of this

council, including the minister's own cabinet officials and members of the business community. The council has had two full years to prepare its people strategy report. That is the one we have been waiting for. Two years ago we asked for that. In fact, the people's agenda is necessary to support the government and the business agenda and we are still waiting for it.

The Premier's Council has failed to put forward recommendations in virtually every key area it has been examining. This is a report I know well: training taxes on employers, worker-sponsored training programs, increased notice of impending layoffs and plant shutdowns, student streaming, greater student-sponsored—

The Speaker: Order. Do you have much more material there?

Mrs Cunningham: Yes, I do. I have a question.

The Premier's Council is clearly failing in its mandate. Will the minister admit it?

Hon Mr Kwinter: I certainly will not admit that the Premier's Council has failed in its mandate. If anything, I think the Premier's Council is a unique opportunity and it has fulfilled its mandate.

I should tell the member I was in Edmonton on Monday and Tuesday attending a meeting of science and technology councils from across the country. I can say, without being partisan, the unanimous decision of all of those councils is that the Premier's Council of Ontario is absolutely the model they would emulate.

To get back to the member's question, I should tell her that the Premier's Council is a unique collaboration. For the first time in government policy advice, we have labour, industry, government and academia sitting together, checking their prejudices at the door, to deal with a problem and benefit all the citizens of Ontario.

We are now at a very difficult time only because we are dealing with an area which impacts directly on labour and industry—

The Speaker: Thank you. Perhaps you might continue after the next supplementary.

Mrs Cunningham: You are very perceptive, Mr Speaker.

Look, nobody wants to see this work more than our party. But two years ago on 25 May 1988 the member for York Mills asked the minister, "Will the Premier's Council continue to meet and will it continue to work with its same mandate?" There was a question two years ago about the mandate.

The minister responded at that time: "They are also going to look at what they think is the major thrust of what we have to do; that is, to look at people." That was two years ago.

The minister readily admits the development of a people strategy is a major thrust of the Premier's Council. Council is no closer to developing consensus proposals on a people agenda than it was two years ago.

1420

The Speaker: And the question?

Mrs Cunningham: The question was asked two years ago, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Well, ask it again.

Mrs Cunningham: I will ask it again. Clearly something has to be done either to expand it or change the mandate, because it is not working. What is it going to be?

Hon Mr Kwinter: I do not agree with the premise that the member has presented. I should tell members that when it comes to the issue of the whole area of people, human resources, the committee has been working, a draft document has been prepared, it has been circulated. It is not a secret. Members have read about it. There is not consensus. We are having another meeting on 11 June, and I am confident that given the goodwill of all of the participants, we will come out with a consensus. But it is a difficult issue because we are dealing with an area that gets very sensitive, it gets almost into the area of labour negotiations, and it is a difficult issue.

I want to assure all members of this House that the Premier's Council is alive, it is well, it is functioning, and again, given the goodwill of all its members, I am confident that we will come up with a consensus document.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. This may be irregular. I would like to inform the members how to ask a question:

I just received a senior citizen's badge with a note saying, "You qualify." Who did it? You? Okay, thank you.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Mr Speaker, the only time you will get a straight answer is from the opposition. I thought the answer was also a message that could be sent across to the other side of the House.

[Later]

Mr McCague: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Under what standing order is the Speaker allowed to ask questions?

The Speaker: I will not answer that.

ABORTION

Mr R. F. Johnston: I have a question for the Attorney General. On Tuesday 29 May, Bill C-43 was passed in the House of Commons and abortion has again been criminalized in this country. We have been set back again to the situation where women and doctors have to fear their decision-making around having abortions. Yet since that time we have had no statement from the Attorney General or from this government about how it is going to react and interpret this piece of legislation in the province of Ontario, and I would like to give the Attorney General the opportunity to do so now.

Hon Mr Scott: As the honourable member's question reflects, changes in the Criminal Code of Canada are made by the Parliament of Canada, and in this case the Parliament of Canada has passed an amendment that is dealing with the subject to which the honourable member refers. It is obviously in very different form than the sections which it replaces and which were struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada, and it is difficult therefore, notwithstanding the debate that was held in the House of Commons, to predict precisely how the courts will interpret its provisions if a prosecution is ever launched.

The honourable member will know that I do not launch prosecutions, that they are launched by police officers or other citizens who take informations of sworn belief. But I have the capacity, as I have done in cases like this, to either proceed with prosecutions or to stay prosecutions, and we will be dealing with any prosecutions that do arise, if they do arise, according to those standards.

Mr R. F. Johnston: The minister will know that many doctors now are deciding to in fact change their position on abortion and to not proceed with them because of fears of third-

party interventions and that the Attorney General in Alberta has indicated—more strongly than he has just done—Mr Rostad has said he will instruct his prosecuting attorneys across the province not to proceed with third-party charges that may be laid.

I want to have an assurance from the Attorney General—I was hoping I would have an assurance from him today—that he will take that principle position as well and not deal with third-party interventions on a case-by-case basis.

Hon Mr Scott: I read what my colleague the Attorney General of Alberta has said, but I do not believe an Attorney General or indeed a Legislature has the right to ignore a provision of the Criminal Code if the appropriate circumstances have led to a prosecution instituted by lawful authority. We cannot declare that a section of the Criminal Code does not exist in the province of Ontario. That is the first point.

As the honourable member knows, the Attorney General has the power, in a case where he judges a prosecution to be oppressive or improperly motivated or inadequately founded, to stay a prosecution. As the honourable member will know, I have exercised that power in one instance in a similar case and I will continue to exercise my capacity under the Criminal Code in that way.

RESIGNATION OF CABINET MINISTER

Mr Runciman: I am going to go back to the government House leader with respect to the non-answer he supplied to my earlier question.

There have been concerns expressed on this side of the House by both opposition parties surrounding the reasons given for the resignation of the Minister of Culture and Communications and some questioning as to how serious the charges against that individual were in order to merit her resignation. We have asked on a number of occasions whether there is more to this than we have been told in respect to the public comments by both the Premier and the minister. We have looked at previous instances of bad judgement by members of cabinet which have not resulted in resignations.

We are talking about the possibility of a document before cabinet which would have recommended the government support wide-open competition for long-distance services. The minister said he is not prepared to comment on anything that may or may not have appeared before cabinet. It seems to me if it did not appear before cabinet, he can quite clearly stand up here today and say it was not before cabinet. Will he not answer that right now?

Hon Mr Ward: As I indicated before, I am not prepared to either confirm or deny that an item was before cabinet.

Mr Runciman: I think this a very serious matter indeed and apparently there is more to this than meets the eye. It is quite apparent and it is certainly indicated clearly here today by the minister refusing to respond in respect to whether this matter was before cabinet, whether the minister played a role and, if indeed a decision was made, a positive one based on the recommendation of the minister who apparently was utilizing the services of clients of her ministry to regain a nomination.

I think it is quite serious and we have to know indeed whether the government has been unduly influenced or improperly influenced in respect to decisions made by it. I think it is important.

Will the minister assure the House today that he is prepared to discuss this with the Premier of the province and perhaps

refer this matter to some form of inquiry, perhaps by a standing committee of the Legislature?

Hon Mr Ward: The member makes a number of inferences but he should know as a former member of the executive council, albeit for a brief period of time, that I am not at liberty to confirm or deny any item that was before cabinet for consideration.

PAY EQUITY

Mr Faubert: My question is for the Minister of Labour. Recently I have received a number of calls from nurses in my riding about the government's pay equity legislation. They are concerned that under the current act they may not be able to achieve true pay equity.

Could the minister please advise me and the nurses of this province how the act will affect them?

Hon Mr Phillips: I realize that many members in the House are getting comments from nurses. I think frankly we can reassure them. I think to a great extent they are mistaken. The pay equity legislation does indeed cover nurses. We feel the current methods within the act will cover a large percentage of the nurses. You may be aware, Mr Speaker, that in March I announced that we will be providing a further opportunity for pay equity to benefit nurses by something called proportional value. We think the combination of those two things will cover virtually all the nurses.

I might add that we feel there are about 1,750,000 women who work in companies of 10 or more employees in this province and we think with the combination of these two things, the proportional value and the male comparator, all but about 5% will be able to benefit under our pay equity legislation.

1430

Mr Faubert: I have also been contacted by nurses in my riding who are represented by the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario, and I can tell the minister that the nurses I have talked to are very upset. In fact, they recently held a news conference to express their views, and it was stated at that time, "It would be cheaper and fairer to scrap the whole process."

Could the minister please respond to the concerns which these nurses so obviously share?

Hon Mr Phillips: I am aware of those comments. I am also aware of comments of the third party that it also would dismantle the pay equity legislation. Having said that, though, I think we should be aware that the Ontario Nurses' Association, which represents, I think, well over half the nurses in this province, said that it felt those comments of scrapping the legislation were "ill-founded" and that it is having success in working with the act.

So I would say, on behalf of the government, that we are dedicated to pay equity. We are dedicated to this legislation. We are dedicated to improving this legislation, and rather than looking back at any thought of dismantling it or at the suggestion by the registered nurses of scrapping the act, we in fact are planning to strengthen the act to ensure that in this province women in the workplace have equity in terms of remuneration.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr Morin-Strom: I have a question for the Minister of Northern Development with respect to highways in northern Ontario. Six months ago, the ministers of transportation across

Canada issued a report on a national highway strategy for the country that identified types of improvements required of each jurisdiction in order to meet a national highway policy standard, and the relative cost of that work.

It included in Ontario some \$2.2 billion, most of which, some \$1.4 billion, is for twinning and four-laning in northern Ontario, including four-laning required on Highway 69 between Waubaushene and Sudbury, Highway 17 east of Sault Ste Marie and Highway 17 east and west of Thunder Bay.

I wonder if the minister could tell us what in fact the government's policy is on this document and what the timetable for this work is going to be.

L'hon M. Fontaine : Premièrement, je tiens à remercier le député de Sault Ste-Marie pour cette question. One thing I do not understand is: Is it a report from the federal government?

Mr Morin-Strom: All the transportation ministers across Canada.

Hon Mr Fontaine: Okay. First of all, I think I will go back to the question.

Our commitment for the next five years was announced in two sections. I announced the one from Thunder Bay and area with the Minister of Natural Resources and, on behalf of the Minister of Transportation, the section for the northwest, and I announced with the Minister of Transportation a section for the northeast. I think our share is there. If the federal government wants to put some more money—I have always said that if we want a four-lane highway, we cannot do that alone—and if the federal government is prepared to do it with the other ministers of this country, we will do it.

What I announced are Highway 69 and Highway 11 and the four-laning from Nipigon to Thunder Bay, an outer passing lane. That is our commitment from the province and my ministry, and if the feds are so good, well, maybe at the next meeting pretty soon—I think there is another meeting—they will come up with their money.

Mr Morin-Strom: This report includes the recommendations from all the ministries of transportation across Canada, including the province of Ontario, and it includes a program which is much more generous than the one this government is committed to at this point.

In the budget we have a commitment from this government to see a \$5-billion plan to improve the transportation system in Metropolitan Toronto. That is more than enough to cover the four-laning of Highway 17 and the Trans-Canada Highway right across northern Ontario.

Why will this minister not work to get his government to commit to a similar kind of program to ensure we do have a national highway across Ontario, that it will provide the kinds of benefits we need in the north?

L'hon M. Fontaine : Que le député ne s'énerve pas là.

First of all, in the last three years, 60% more money was put in my base budget, plus another percentage, \$131 million and over, for highways 11, 17 and 69.

I have said it many times, and again, ourselves, the tax that we are paying, if we spend too much money, we always say, "Don't tax the people any more." But with the money that we got this year, last year and the year before, I got my share.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Fontaine: Never mind. Why don't you listen a little bit?

We are working with the federal government to try to get more money from it because it put a tax on fuel and we did not get one cent from it for the north. So we will go back. The leader of the second party should not worry. My feeling is that again we tripled the budget in the last three years. Right now, everybody is working.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon Mr Fontaine: Mr Speaker, I want to tell you something. When I was in Nipigon two weeks ago, people are so glad in Nipigon that they say maybe they will vote Liberal this time because I gave them four-laning from Nipigon to Thunder Bay.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. What a waste of time. Are all members finished now?

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES

Mrs Marland: My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. For five years the government has been reviewing the mandate and operation of conservation authorities. Two and a half years ago the Bugar report was released. Since then the Ballinger committee has reviewed that report and made its recommendations, but we have yet to see an implementation plan.

Recently in the standing committee on estimates, the minister said she plans to establish yet another committee to consult with the conservation authorities and oversee the implementation of the changes. Does she intend to send out this committee to meet with the conservation authorities before releasing the plan to the Legislature?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I am not sure whether the honourable member is asking for specific copies of past reports, which I would certainly be happy to make available. I have written to all the conservation authorities across the province giving them the background material on the recommendations of the Ballinger report and the specific changes which that report made to the previous report the member referred to, which was the Bugar report.

Those details are well known. The reason for sending those letters out with that degree of detail was to ensure that we would provide an opportunity for conservation authorities and municipalities to be able to respond to the changes proposed.

In the course of hearing their responses and in meeting with the full group of conservation authorities, I became aware that there remain a number of concerns for a number of the authorities. We take those concerns very seriously and that is why indeed we have established yet another committee which will work with the remaining concerns of the authorities.

Mrs Marland: I think it is obvious from her answer that the minister is aware that the conservation authorities have some discomfort with the report and some of the recommendations. Certainly, they are concerned about the delays in implementing the new plan. She also is aware that the authorities are sitting on their budgets and they cannot make decisions. We are really concerned about how inappropriate it is to consider consulting behind closed doors. We feel the time has come for open discussion and action.

I would like to ask the minister if she will commit herself to sharing the implementation plan with us right away.

1440

Hon Mrs McLeod: I would want to provide some clarification. What is in place and certainly open for the examination of any member of the Legislature, as it is for all conservation authorities, municipal leaders and any others who are interested in reform of the conservation authorities are the two reports, the Bugar report and the Ballinger report. There is nothing beyond that in the nature of an implementation plan.

In response to the recommendations of the Ballinger report, there have been some further concerns that still remain with the authorities and there are quite different concerns that I hear. The honourable member is correct in saying that there are some authorities that would like to move ahead with the changes and are concerned about the delay. We recognize that the very process of delay creates some uncertainty, and our conservation authorities branch is working with authorities, for example, that have appointments to make.

But there are other authorities that say they have concerns about the funding proposals and their implications, and some concern about amalgamation. We have not put in place firm plans for implementation because we want to work with those kinds of concerns before developing a final plan for implementation of any review of the structure of the conservation authorities.

WINE INDUSTRY

Mr Dietsch: My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Recently he made some very welcome changes in policy at the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and I am curious if he would inform this House as to how many wineries have been able to take advantage of those recent changes in policy permitting Sunday openings and credit card sales and what these changes have meant.

Hon Mr Sorbara: I appreciate the question from the member for St Catharines-Brock and the notice he gave me of the question because I can point with some satisfaction to the co-ordination of two government policies that really have resulted in very significant benefit to our Ontario wine industry.

Of course, under laws relating to Sunday shopping, for years retail businesses have been able to open on Sunday in tourist areas, but the estate wineries in the Niagara Peninsula, because of other regulations in the Liquor Licence Act, have not been able to open, and they historically have not been able to use credit cards.

A few months ago the government announced it was going to change that policy so that if a municipality wanted the estate wineries to remain open on Sunday to very significant tourist traffic, they would be able to do that. I am happy to report to my friend the member for St Catharines-Brock that all indications are that tourists are finding the estate wineries interesting places to visit on Sunday and they are making use of their credit cards, and it is going very well.

Mr Dietsch: I believe it necessary that we be supportive and innovative in assisting wineries, recognizing that greater wine sales represent greater grape sales. Does the government have any intentions with respect to direct sales from the producers of such wines to the licensee, therefore eliminating the LCBO and the middleman while passing on substantial cost savings, with possible increase in sales, to the wineries?

Hon Mr Sorbara: I can understand why my friend the member for St Catharines-Brock asked that question. I do not think there is any member in this House who is more supportive

and a greater advocate of the Ontario wine industry than the member for St Catharines-Brock. He certainly has spoken to me on this question on a number of occasions, as have the wineries. I should tell him it is one of the areas we are working on, because the wineries see the opportunity to sell their products directly to restaurants and licensed establishments all over the province and to get their products to the public in a more direct and, frankly, cheaper way.

There have been incredible changes in the wine industry over the past 10 years, as my friend knows, and certainly they are producing a product that is competitive all over the world. All I can tell him at this point is that we are looking at models that may eventually permit that kind of direct sale to come about, but there are certainly issues relating to taxation and our trade agreements, etc.

USE OF HERBICIDE

Mr Hampton: My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. As the minister knows, the herbicide Vision is widely used by the Ministry of Natural Resources as a herbicide spray in Ontario's forests. Recently the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety stated that it recommends that very extreme care be used when Vision is being sprayed because it contains the very toxic substance dioxane. As well, tests done by the International Agency for Research on Cancer showed that dioxane was carcinogenic in rats and guinea pigs, and the National Cancer Institute in the United States found that dioxane could cause tumours in rats and mice and could produce toxic effects in the kidney and liver of humans.

In view of this kind of evidence, is the minister not concerned about the widespread use of Vision for spraying in Ontario's forests?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I assure the honourable member, as I would assure all members of the Legislature and concerned Ontarians, that we will use only herbicides which are fully approved by the federal Department of the Environment and by our own Ministry of the Environment and that we will in fact use those with all caution, as we do with all our spray programs, regardless of the herbicide or pesticide that is being used.

If there is evidence that comes forward in relation to any of the herbicides or pesticides which the ministry is using and ministries of the environment in fact reflect that concern in their regulations or their approvals, we will of course adjust our programs accordingly.

Mr Hampton: A couple of questions come out of that. While the federal Department of Agriculture in fact registers the use of these types of chemicals, there is no evidence that very careful testing has been done for the presence of dioxane in Vision. There is no evidence that the kinds of careful tests that have been carried out, for example, by the US Environmental Protection Agency, have been carried out here in Canada.

Furthermore, the Ministry of Natural Resources has had no problem banning the use of certain pesticides in the past even before the federal Department of Agriculture has gotten involved. The ministry has acted on external advice, external information before, without any assistance from the federal Department of Agriculture. Why will the minister not do it in this case? Why does she continue to use Vision when there is evidence from outside Canada that Vision does indeed contain very toxic, very harmful chemicals?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I trust that my words were accurately conveying my sense that it is not the Ministry of Natural

Resources that carries out the research. We are dependent on the appropriate environmental ministries with the research capacity to carry out that research. We are, as I indicated, very careful in all our spray programs in terms of the areas in which the spraying is used, the notification that is given and the actual application of the herbicides or pesticides we are using.

Of course, we are concerned and will continue to be concerned that whatever methods we are using, whether to control forest pests or to manage the vegetation in the forest, we will be practising environmentally sound management, and we will continue to look at all the spray programs we have to provide that assurance, but we do not carry out the research ourselves. We will look at the research that is carried out and the implications of that research for our programs.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr Runciman: I have a question again for the government House leader on a different topic. It is one I raised earlier in the week in this House in respect to what has been happening with the standing committee on general government in the first effort by an opposition party under the new standing orders, standing order 123, to have a matter referred for study by the committee.

As you know, Mr Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party has asked for an investigation into why, in the fall of 1989, the Office of the Premier halted an inquiry into the activities in York region before the recommendations made their way to cabinet. We have had a number of stalling efforts by Liberal members of that committee and they really have frustrated our efforts to get this matter on the floor. The New Democratic Party House leader and our House leader are in agreement, and I am asking the government House leader if he would support a recommendation to the Speaker for immediate approval of a supplementary budget for legal counsel to be retained by the committee.

Hon Mr Ward: The member knows full well of the committee's authority to order its own business. I understand that a request will be forthcoming in the very near future from the committee for a budget to retain legal counsel, among other things. That will be considered as expeditiously as possible by the Board of Internal Economy, which I believe is slated to meet next week, and we will do everything we can to hasten it.

1450

Mr Runciman: The minister is not aware when the board is meeting obviously. It is not meeting until 11 June and, in effect, what he and his colleagues are doing is killing this hearing. What he is doing is frustrating the intent of the new standing orders, which were achieved by agreement of all three parties in this House.

As the minister knows full well, the opposition parties gave up a number of opportunities whereby they could compel the government to deal with issues through bell-ringing, etc, as a result of these changes. What he is doing now is frustrating the intent of the changes to the standing orders.

All I am asking the minister today is, will he support the NDP House leader and our House leader in handling this quickly, asking the Speaker to deal immediately with this and have a supplementary budget approved so that we can retain legal counsel and get on with these hearings next week?

Hon Mr Ward: I am not as yet in receipt of the committee's request. I can assure the member that we will deal

with it expeditiously, and if there are mechanisms by which we can do that, we will certainly do that.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Miss Roberts: My question is to the Minister of Education. On 29 May 1990, I presented to this House petitions from my constituents requesting new initiatives in the field of religious education. In light of the recent Court of Appeal ruling, in light of section 50 of the Education Act, in light of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and in light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, my constituents are seeking the continuance of Christian religious education and moral ethics in Ontario public schools.

What is the minister's stand on the possibility of providing time for opt-in classes in all our public schools for such religious education to all those students whose parents request it?

Hon Mr Conway: I thank my friend the member for Elgin for her interest in and concern about a matter of very real interest to many in the community. I can tell her what I indicated to school boards some weeks ago.

In light of the Court of Appeal decision of late January this year in respect of the so-called Elgin county case, I indicated to all school boards in Ontario that they could not offer religious education at the elementary level in public schools if that religious education was of an indoctrinational kind. But as the court indicated, education about religion, education which seeks to foster moral values, is permissible, and we have indicated this to all school boards.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Surely you received a report on this several months ago.

Hon Mr Conway: Moreover, in the interim policy announcement that I made earlier this year, I say to the member and to my friend the member for Scarborough West, who seems to have come alive to this subject, that it is possible for an individual religion to have the opportunity on an after-school basis to have certain kinds of instruction as long as the school board makes the school space on an after-school basis available to all in the community.

Miss Roberts: I thank the minister for his answer. My supplementary deals with perhaps a curriculum of some type or a further policy statement that he might be making with respect to the types of classes that may be offered in religious education, if indeed he is going to be doing that.

Hon Mr Conway: The member's question and my friend from Scarborough West's parenthetical observation take into account the fact that we have received the so-called Watson report. At the time of the court judgement earlier this winter, I indicated that there would be an interim policy, that the government would be reviewing its options in respect to this most sensitive area of public policy in light of both the court decision and the Watson report.

I can assure my honourable friend and the member for Scarborough West that we are doing that. In the fullness of time, I expect to be communicating both with the House and with the school community about any progress we have made in this regard.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

Miss Martel: I have a question to the Minister of Labour. Several weeks ago, I raised the matter with him of 120 vocational rehabilitation case workers at the Workers' Compensation

Board. The individuals were hired in December 1989. They were told they would have permanent employment, provided they met a six-month probationary period. In March they received a letter from the board stating that the board had over-recruited by accident and that they no longer had permanent employment.

On 8 March the board began another recruitment drive, this time for the same positions of vocational rehabilitation case workers, the same group of 120 individuals who lost their permanent employment two months before. Can the minister tell me now what kind of problems are going on at the Workers' Compensation Board?

Hon Mr Phillips: The administration of the board, of course, rests with the board and under the board of directors. Having said that, the explanation that I think I gave once before in the House was that they indeed had overrecruited for vocational rehabilitation officers, that there were many of their permanent employees who wanted those positions and were given those positions, that the probationary case workers, I am told, were assured that they would have a job within the organization and that, as those vocational rehabilitation case work jobs became available, they would be offered them.

I have recently been told that quite a large number of them have now moved into those positions and that, over the next 12 to 18 months, it is the anticipation of the board that most of those people will be accommodated. That is what I have been told by the board, and I would be interested if that is not the case.

Miss Martel: That is not the case. The recruitment drive began on 10 May and it is due to finish on 16 July 1990. The fact of the matter is that the pecking order for recruitment is as follows: All the affected staff, that is, people who have lost their employment at the board because of organizational or technological change, will be asked to apply for the rehab jobs first. Then any other members in the WCB organization from whatever unit across the organization will be asked if they want to apply for those positions. Finally, if there are any permanent positions left, those 120 people who lost their employment already will be asked to apply.

The fact of the matter is that they will be lucky if any of the 120 actually receive some employment. What is the minister going to do to try and protect these people who were promised permanent jobs, who lost them and who will have no chance of regaining them?

Hon Mr Phillips: I will repeat what I said earlier, that is, they were probationary individuals recruited and there was no question that the board overrecruited and then filled those positions with permanent employees who felt that they wanted those positions. The probationary workers, I am told, were given other similar positions, not in the same field but similar positions, and they were assured that as positions became available in the vocational rehabilitation case work area they would be offered them.

As I say, I have been told that many of them already have secured those positions, and that it was the expectation of the board that over the next 12 to 18 months the vast majority of them could be accommodated as positions became available.

CHARITABLE GAMING

Mr McCague: Mr Speaker, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations was here. Has he left the building or is he hiding?

The Speaker: Is that your question to someone? I do not see—oh, here is the minister. Please go ahead.

Mr McCague: The minister has not had many questions lately so I can understand his wandering around.

The minister's lotteries branch is really harming a lot of the charitable efforts of a lot of service clubs within the province by not issuing licences quickly for tickets that have a name starting with N, which we are not supposed to use, but I think you pull a tab. You call them pull-tab tickets or something like that. Anyway, these have been good money-raising ventures for a lot of clubs, and the minister has really messed it up. What is he going to do about it?

Hon Mr Sorbara: My friend has not been asking very many questions lately in the House nor has he been following very carefully the changes that we are making within the entertainment standards branch, particularly as it relates to charitable gaming and what we call Nevada tickets, I tell my friend the member for Dufferin-Peel, I think it is.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Sorbara: Ten years ago, yes, but the question was probably was more appropriate to 10 years ago in any event.

Mr Ferraro: It's Simcoe West.

1500

Hon Mr Sorbara: Simcoe West, I am told by my friend the member for Guelph, who keeps up on these matters.

Let me just say to the member on this question that the Tories seemed to throw in at the last minute at the end of question period—I am sorry, Mr Speaker, for my momentary absence—I just want to refer the member to a document that we put out some four months ago called Charitable Gaming, Putting the Charities Back in the Driver's Seat.

We are undergoing very substantial revisions to the laws and regulations relating to not only bingos but break-open tickets and Monte Carlo nights and the like. The full purpose of these initiatives is to make sure that the real beneficiaries are not the people who run the halls or print up the tickets, but the charities themselves who through their voluntary efforts raise quite a substantial amount of money to help charitable causes all over the province.

I am going to send my friend the paper and perhaps he will ask another question on it some time later.

PETITIONS

SCHOOL OPENING AND CLOSING EXERCISES

Mrs Cunningham: This is just one small sampling of a petition given to me from over 6,000 residents from all over Ontario and it calls on the government to support the daily use of the Lord's Prayer in Ontario's public schools.

The Speaker: You have signed it as well?

Mrs Cunningham: Yes, I will sign the covering letter.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Miss Roberts: I have a petition from members in my riding. They respectfully request that the government of Ontario provide time for opt-in classes in all public schools for the teaching of religious education and moral ethics to all students. If this cannot be provided, they request publicly funded Christian schools on the same basis as Roman Catholic schools.

I have affixed my name to the petition, pursuant to the standing orders.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Reycraft moved first reading of Bill 174, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Reycraft: Subsection 125(6) of the Landlord and Tenant Act prohibits a landlord of a mobile home park from acting as the agent of a tenant with respect to the sale of a mobile home except when under a written agency contract.

The proposed amendments to the act would require an agency contract to be separate and distinct from a tenancy agreement. An agency contract would not be valid unless entered into after the tenant decides to sell the tenant's mobile home.

The amendments would apply to agency contracts entered into before or after the amendments come into effect.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Mr Kanter moved second reading of Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

CITY OF BRAMPTON ACT, 1990

Mr Ferraro moved, on behalf of Mr Callahan, second reading of Bill Pr43, An Act respecting the City of Brampton.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

VICTORIA COUNTY RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED ACT, 1990

Mr Owen moved, on behalf of Mr Eakins, second reading of Bill Pr63, An Act respecting The Victoria County Railway Company Limited.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

ONTARIO SKEET SHOOTING ASSOCIATION ACT, 1990

Mr Eves moved, on behalf of Mr Cureatz, second reading of Bill Pr64, An Act to revive Ontario Skeet Shooting Association.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

HAREWOOD PARK ASSOCIATION ACT, 1990

Mr Matrundola moved, on behalf of Mr MacDonald, second reading of Bill Pr67, An Act to revive the Harewood Park Association.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

1510

SILAYAN FILIPINO COMMUNITY CENTRE ACT, 1990

Mr Velshi moved second reading of Bill Pr72, An Act to revive Silayan Filipino Community Centre.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

JABKO HOLDINGS LTD ACT, 1990

Mr Owen moved second reading of Bill Pr76, An Act to revive Jabko Holdings Ltd.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Mr Ward: Before calling the next order, I would like, pursuant to standing order 53, to indicate the business for the upcoming week.

On Monday 4 June we will have second reading of Bill 108, second reading of Bill 106, Bill 104, Bill 105 and Bill 140.

On Tuesday 5 June we will have second reading of Bill 96.

Wednesday 6 June will be a continuation of unfinished business from Monday and Tuesday, if not completed. At the conclusion of the second reading debate of Bill 96, we will proceed to committee of the whole House on Bill 208.

On Thursday 7 June, in the morning we will have private member's ballot item 53, in the name of the member for Sault Ste Marie, and ballot item 54, in the name of the member for Nepean.

ONTARIO LOTTERY CORPORATION AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act.

The Speaker: I believe the member for Cambridge was speaking previously.

Mr Farnan: Resuming the debate on An Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, Bill 114, as I pointed out in my remarks yesterday, this bill will simply add yet another area to which lottery profits can be designated.

I took considerable time yesterday talking about compulsive gambling. I suggested to the government that part of my rationale for supporting this bill is if the government can bring itself to accept certain key amendments.

The first one I debated at some length yesterday, and that amendment was simply that 0.5% of all lottery profits would be designated for the provision of treatment for those afflicted with compulsive gambling as a disease. That 0.5% represents half a cent of every \$1 of lottery profits. When we consider that lottery profits this year will be in the range \$500 million, we are simply asking the government to designate something less than \$2.5 million to provide gambling rehabilitation treatment. There is not one treatment clinic in Ontario; indeed, there is not one treatment clinic in all of Canada. In fact, we are sending those people who are afflicted with this disease to the United States for treatment at considerable cost, and they have to pay 25% of that cost themselves.

I want to re-emphasize that I and my party, the New Democratic Party, are not opposed to the fact that lotteries are a reality of life. We are not here to say that they should be curtailed or abolished, and we realize that the government will generate, has generated and will continue to generate significant profits through lotteries. What we are saying is that there are some significant side-effects to lotteries. When you expose the population of Ontario to aggressive marketing of what I called yesterday the dream, when you are encouraging people through advertisements, whether it be by newspaper, radio or television, and telling them that if they make the wager of \$2 they are going to have this dream, some people are going to be affected and will become compulsive gamblers. I pointed out that 2% to 3% of our population suffer from the disease of compulsive gambling.

I want to read to the members today the testimony of just three individuals. I have testimony here from a whole range of individuals, which I would dearly love all members of this House to have. In fact, I think I will ask my assistant to have copies run off and sent to all members of this House because it is an area that many of them may not be too familiar with. But we should be familiar with it because in fact we are promoting gambling in a very aggressive way through our marketing of lotteries.

First of all is the case of George M. These are real, live people. George M's case is typical of that of anyone with a compulsive gambling problem, in that it took George many years to realize he was the victim of an uncontrollable illness.

George began his gambling career on a small-time basis in 1959, but 15 years later he had, by his own admission, dug a hole so deep that he could not see daylight any more. He lost his self-esteem, respect, confidence and all moral and spiritual values. On 21 May 1976 he tried to commit suicide but, in his own words, "I couldn't even do that right." However, with the help of his wife and some legal aid, George came out of that suicide attempt a better person. He did not make a wager for six years and gained back some respect and confidence.

But in 1982 George discovered the lotteries. At first, George merely experimented with small amounts of money he made moonlighting on a second job. From \$13 per week, George went to spending \$95 per week on lottery tickets. But he could not win anything, so he accelerated his wagering to \$190 per week. Still no success, so George upped the ante to \$380 per week. Worst of all, George's bad habits returned also and he started to borrow and to steal. Soon George was back in debt and lying to his wife to cover his tracks. George's wife recognized the symptoms and gave George an ultimatum: either to get help or she would leave him.

George finally got the message. He joined Gamblers Anonymous and he has not gambled since 1986. But for every lucky person like George who manages to get help with his problem, there are countless thousands of pathological gamblers walking the streets unable to recognize their own plight. It is these people who need help in the worst way, and the establishment of a modern treatment clinic would go a long way towards alleviating the problem. I ask the minister, how about it?

I can recall, through personal experience, a man coming into my office. His lifestyle now is a lifestyle between jail and lottery tickets. He comes out of jail, he has the dream, he thinks he is going to win and he buys lottery tickets. He sustains his addiction by stealing, and he knows that if he is caught he is going to go back to jail, but he thinks he is going to hit it big. He is convinced he is going to hit it big, and his whole life is

destroyed, the people he loves—his wife, his children, those friends close around him. He cannot control himself.

Here is the testimony of Cindy. If members think pathological gambling is confined to the victim, they should listen to the poignant tale of Cindy, the wife of a self-admitted pathological gambler. Says Cindy: "Pathological gambling is a family disease and I can certainly attest to the illness we have all been battling. The heartache and sadness is that no facility is available near home for the treatment of this illness."

Cindy's husband attended the Taylor Manor Clinic in Baltimore for help with his addiction. While he was there, it was suggested Cindy participate in some of the family sessions. But, says Cindy, they could not afford such a luxury. "How sad for us that we were unable to receive therapy together at a clinic close to home where money would not be a concern."

1520

Cindy also points out that as rehabilitation and recovery are lifelong processes, it is imperative that victims and their families continue to receive medical support as aftercare. Says Cindy, "Although our support groups (Gamblers Anonymous and Gam-Anon) have been an immeasurable source of help, medical practitioners would be an even greater and much-needed source of support for families in despair."

Cindy firmly believes the 1990s will be the decade when pathological gambling emerges as a problem which will have to be addressed by responsible authorities here: "This sector of pathological gambling will definitely increase as the opportunities for gambling increase also. The alcoholic and substance abusers already have support and now it is time to focus on the same devastation endured by the pathological gambler and his family."

She asks the question, "When, Minister, can we expect this government to take some concrete action towards the establishment of a clinic?"

Although pathological gamblers have a similar addiction to the alcoholic or the drug abuser, we cannot recognize them. They do not stagger, they are not easily distinguishable, but nevertheless lives are destroyed, the lives of themselves and those people around them.

Here is the case of Ken, a self-admitted pathological gambler who even tried to commit suicide in an attempt to escape from his turmoil.

Ken says that for more than 20 years he lived principally to gamble. His family, friends, career, personal health and welfare took a back seat. He admits that he stole money, cars, drugs and, in his own words, "anything else I could get away with to finance my betting." This is exactly the road or the treadmill that the alcoholic or the drug abuser goes down.

When he got married seven years ago, Ken did try to do something about his problem. He tried to stop gambling and he cut down on his other addictions, to alcohol, drugs and food. But his best intentions were not good enough. With his wife's help, he even tried to get some therapy, but found himself unable to quit gambling for any length of time.

Listen to what he says here next: "My self-hatred grew to the point of suicidal thoughts. I changed jobs, tried willpower but always went back to gambling. Finally, I attempted suicide believing my wife and children would be better off without me."

His suicide attempt failed and triggered what he now refers to as a series of miracles. He is in a 12-step recovery program and has learned that his gambling addiction was really a disease. From Parkside Hospital in Chicago, Ken returned to his

home and family here only a few months ago to try to reconstruct his life.

Why do pathological gamblers like Ken have to go to the United States to get help with their problem? Why can they not get it here? When this province is generating \$500 million in profits from lotteries, why do Ken, Cindy, George and the literally hundreds of thousands of Ontarians who are addicted to gambling and the families of those addicted gamblers who suffer as a consequence—why is there not one clinic in Ontario to address their needs?

I am putting forward what I consider to be a rather minimum request, that 0.5% of lottery profits, a mere \$2.5 million out of a grand total of \$500 million, that that small amount be given to provide treatment for the pathological gambler in Ontario.

My colleagues in this House know this is not the first time I have spoken to this issue. I have raised it on other occasions. It is probably the first time where I have had an opportunity to discuss it at some length, but I have raised the matter in the House and I have written to the Minister of Health pointing out the need.

In some of the jurisdictions in the United States up to 3% of profits is allocated to gambling rehabilitation. As I pointed out, in the state of Iowa, a small farming state, they have 13 clinics for gambling rehabilitation. Surely we must hang our heads in shame, not just in Ontario but right across Canada, when we cannot point to one clinic. What do we do in this great province? We contribute \$50,000 to a foundation. It is not good enough.

This bill that is before us today is simply a way to encourage the people of Ontario to buy more lottery tickets. The ministry has brought in marketing experts. The marketing experts said to the minister, "If you want to sell more lottery tickets, you're going to have to change the manner in which you address the issue." In the past it was Wintario, and it was for sports, culture, recreation and fitness. The lottery tickets had those pictures on them—the javelin thrower, the high-jumper, the orchestra.

But someone sat down and said, "Hey, if we put a crippled child on the lottery ticket, if we put flowing rivers"—they know the environment now is something that will sell more lottery tickets. The reality is, we will sell more lottery tickets; there is absolutely no question about it. But this government and all of us in this House, Conservative, Liberals and New Democrats, all 130 of us, have to recognize the fact that as we promote lotteries we also push some people, some percentage of the population—and the statistics suggest 2% to 3% of the population—into becoming compulsive gamblers, and they will need treatment.

All I suggest to my colleagues is that that small portion, 0.5%, a half a cent out of every dollar, be designated for gambling rehabilitation. That is one of the areas that, if the government accepts this amendment, I may very well be encouraged to support the bill.

The second amendment that I am going to suggest as a requirement of support for the bill is to look at that whole area of profits. We are talking about that \$500 million of profits and I am going to say to the government that I will be placing an amendment before the House, and that amendment will say that at least one third of all of the profits of lotteries go to sports, culture, recreation, fitness and, say, the Ontario Trillium Foundation. That is a reasonable amendment. This is an amendment, as my colleague has pointed out, that I have brought forward before, and I will continue to bring it forward.

I want to address that particular amendment. Back in 1974, when the Ontario Lottery Corp was established, the government of the day designated the profits from lotteries for culture and recreation. The wording of the legislation appeared to be quite specific. It said that lottery profits would be available for culture and recreation. This was reinforced, as I suggested, by government advertising, and lottery tickets bore illustrations of athletes, musicians and artists.

What does it mean to you when the government says that the money will be available? It means that it will be there for you. I give this example: If I go into a restaurant and the waiter says to me, "Your table is now available," I believe that I am going to have that table. That is a reasonable expectation. But to be available from the point of view of this particular government was not a guarantee that the table was available, was not a guarantee that they would get those lottery profits, so over the years the government did not use those moneys for what they were designated for.

1530

In future years, as the Wintario draws were televised from communities across Ontario, we were invariably reminded of the arenas, the little theatres, the orchestras, the community groups that were to be the beneficiaries. However, despite the legislation and the public perception, the government was only spending a portion of lottery profits on culture and recreation and the remainder was going into other areas. That is okay, we are not going to argue about that, but let's face it, only a portion was going to culture and recreation.

Over the years, the accumulated unallocated lottery surplus would have grown to \$400 million in the designated lotteries and to about \$900 million in the interprovincial lotteries if the government had not been spending it. In total, this amounted to a whopping \$1.3-billion surplus. However, we all know that in fact the government was spending that money which had been designated for culture and recreation.

What is particularly galling to the sports, culture, recreation and fitness groups of the province of Ontario is that at a time when the government was spending this money, which was originally allocated, maybe available, groups across the province, thousands of applications from culture and recreation groups that met all the criteria for lottery funding, were being rejected. What particularly irks the cultural and recreational communities is that the reason given for rejecting their applications—and these letters were sent out as a matter of course—the reason the culture and recreation groups were refused their grants, they said, was because of insufficient funds.

How could there be insufficient funds when there was an unallocated surplus of \$1.3 billion? That is a good question. But the government was spending it on different things. It was spending it, I am sure, on hospitals, the environment and other things. We cannot argue with that.

For several weeks I sat as a member of the standing committee on general government of the Legislative Assembly holding hearings into Bill 119. Bill 119, members will recall, retroactively changed the rules of the game. It legalized the misappropriation of the accumulated lottery profits by both Conservative and Liberal governments over the years, and in fact the government, during those hearings, admitted that these moneys were already spent and referred to those moneys, in what I thought was an absolutely beautiful phrase, as a "notional surplus." It really was a surplus that existed only in our minds. In other words, there was \$1.3 billion of unallocated funds that should have gone to culture and recreation, but in the

government's opinion, this was a notional surplus. It had already been spent.

I want to look at Bill 119 and Bill 114 together. Bill 119 at the time pitted culture and recreation against hospitals for future lottery dollars, a situation that hundreds of thousands of volunteers and professionals in culture and recreation found unacceptable. So at first we had lottery profits going to sports, culture, fitness, recreation and the Ontario Trillium Foundation and then we added, "We're also going to use it for hospitals." Bill 114 came along and said, "Okay, we're going to throw into the equation the environment."

The public response to Bill 119 was overwhelmingly negative. Some 228 municipalities, representing 7.5 million people, passed motions in opposition to Bill 119 and not one of the 105 delegations which appeared before the Legislative Assembly committee spoke in favour of the bill.

The position put forward by culture and recreation groups was very reasonable. All they wanted was a guarantee that a minimum of one third of future lottery profits would be designated to culture and recreation. At that particular time, we were talking about \$400 million. My apologies—all they wanted from future lottery profits was one third of the global amount.

I have to admit that during the course of those committee hearings, the Treasurer did appear before the committee and he made a commitment of, I believe, \$120 million per annum for three years. I suppose that is something that we should be grateful for, that he did make that commitment. But it would have been a small step, I believe, and one of great significance if this government had been able to make a real commitment by putting it into the legislation and saying that—one third of \$500 million is certainly more than \$120 million.

There are enough legitimate applications out there that meet all the criteria for us to use one third of lottery profits for culture, sports, recreation and fitness, so I say it would make a lot of sense to write into this legislation the simple amendment that one third of all lottery profits will be designated for culture, sports, fitness and recreation. Even the sports and cultural groups which appeared before the committee said that the rest of the profits can go to hospitals, the environment, roads, sewage treatment plants, anything the government likes. But at least let's guarantee culture and recreation, the designated source for which lotteries were initiated in the first place, one third of the profits.

We did not get that guarantee when we discussed Bill 119, so we come to Bill 114. I want to speak again on behalf of all those community groups, on behalf of the millions of volunteers across this province who enrich our lives through cultural and recreational activities. Believe me, it is those individuals who make life in Ontario that much finer. I think it is a small step to ask that we reward them by including in this legislation an amendment that will protect their interests.

I am not going to read out the whole list of agencies and groups, I am just going to take a couple at random, but literally hundreds of groups appeared before the committee, sent in briefs, asked the government please to listen: the Ontario Arenas Association Inc, Older Adults Centres Associations of Ontario, Ontario Choral Federation, Ontario Library Association, museums, recreation associations, Ontario Parks Association, art galleries, theatres, track and field, Ontario Orienteering Association Inc, bowlers, field hockey, sport and the physically disabled, skating, badminton, soccer, curling, archers, baseball.

1540

I have extracted from those public hearings a variety of quotations that I think help to put the view of these groups in perspective, and it behooves us to listen to remind ourselves of what these groups were telling us.

Mr Faubert: Read the answer also from Hansard if you're going to read the question.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Farnan: As I said, I am going to take some very brief statements to remind the House of some of the areas, how society is enriched by arts and the quality of life and volunteerism.

Margaret Wade Laberge, president of the Council on Aging: "Recreation and cultural activities are an essential component of the high quality of life which we enjoy in Ontario. These activities promote the wellbeing of all."

Doris Haist, director of recreation, York region: "There is no question that recreation opportunities enhance the quality of life in a community and contribute significantly to the health and wellbeing of participants."

"Preventive Health Care: Investment in Well Society" is another heading that I have taken.

Lee Batstone, president, Northwestern Ontario Sports Council: "A disappearance or further erosion of support for sport and recreation organizations will lead to a less healthy population and skyrocketing health costs."

Margaret Thomson, manager, Parks and Recreation, Thunder Bay: "Recreation, sport and fitness have proven to be most effective preventive measures available to reduce health care costs."

Douglas Block, president, Kitchener-Waterloo Symphony: "I frankly think that the arts, symphony orchestras, as well as dance groups and everything else, are just part of the balance of life that we all need to make our communities viable, to attract business, to attract industry."

Many of the groups at that time, as the minister will know and as some of the members of the committee will know, were a bit disturbed by what they felt was a government betrayal of sports, culture and recreation.

John W. Gates, manager, Parks and Recreation, Thunder Bay: "Can the Premier be trusted to live up to this commitment of funds for recreation? Apparently not. If Bill 119 is passed, many of the statements and goals as proclaimed in the 1989 throne speech become nothing more than words. The government is not fully committed to pursuing healthy lifestyles, safe communities and a promising future for our children."

Hockey Development Centre of Ontario: "If this government is committed to sport and recreation, it will withdraw Bill 119. Failure to do so is a betrayal of a promise made to us in 1974."

The final category from which I am going to draw remarks is the need for expansion of leisure time in an aging society. I think these are very critical.

Robert D. Johnston, chairman, Alliance to Protect Culture, Fitness, Sports and Recreation in Ontario: "If you consider that leisure time involves activities not only for most of us but also for senior citizens and for youth, we are probably talking about supporting the activities that most of us spend the majority of our lives doing."

Wayne Burnett, Downsview: "There is no shortage of ideas for the money, no scarcity of need. The surplus that has built up is due to underspending of budgeted funds."

Robert Freeman, director-curator, Gallery Stratford: "No one is denying the importance of hospitals and their need for additional funding, but should it be at the expense of Canadian culture?"

Rhea Shulman, board of directors, Older Adult Centres Association of Ontario: "I believe that older people are extremely well organized in this province...they really are mobilized and they will act as soon as the government...slips a little bit off where it should be.... I think the governments have to listen not just for the votes, but because this a group that can do things."

I have just gleaned a few of the comments.

The amendment that I am putting to the House in order to offer my support for this bill—the second amendment; the first, of course, was the percentage of funds for the treatment of pathological gamblers—is that one third of all profits from lotteries be directed to the source they were originally intended for, sports, culture, recreation and fitness.

What is going on is something of a sham. What we have—and I am going to describe this for members in a very simple way so that the people of Ontario can get a handle on what is happening.

If we can imagine a large pot or retainer into which all of the revenue that is generated by the government is deposited, whether it is personal income tax, taxes on luxury items, sales tax, taxes that are brought about through regulation, increases in licensing fees, motor vehicle fees, hunting and fishing fees or whatever, all of that money goes into a pot and indeed part of the funds going into that big container are the funds generated from lotteries.

So now we have a pot with all of the funds that are generated in the form of revenue for the operation of the province of Ontario, from which we have to pay for our services. The significant contribution of lotteries, the \$500,000, is going into that pot, but it is going into that pot along with every other conceivable form of revenue that this government receives.

So when we pay money to a hospital, or when we pay money for an environmental issue, or when we pay money to parks and recreation, who is to say which source of revenue is paying for hospitals, that it is lottery funds over personal taxation, over a sales tax?

No. The reality of the matter is that we collect taxes from every conceivable source and out of that general consolidated revenue fund we pay for all the various items that a government has to pay for, whether they are roads, hospitals or schools.

But when it comes to selling lottery tickets, I want to say very clearly that I think we have learned from the Irish hospitals sweepstakes. It has been raised in this House a couple of times that before lotteries were legalized in this country, people were buying Irish hospitals sweepstakes tickets in large numbers. It was illegal, but people did it. Indeed, part of the rationale for introducing lotteries into the province of Ontario was to say that we do not want all this money going out of the country, we want to keep it here. A good cause, at that time, we said, was culture and recreation.

The advertising boys, the smart guys who are there to promote lottery sales, have come to the realization that selling lottery tickets based on parks and recreation is fine. If you are putting up community halls or arenas, in putting those arenas up, if you have a picture of kids playing ice hockey, that is appealing. People will go out and buy a ticket.

It is much more powerful when you have the crippled child on your lottery ticket. It is much more powerful when you have the cancer treatment clinic on your lottery ticket. It is much

more powerful when you have the flowing, beautiful river on your lottery ticket.

What we have in this legislation, in Bill 114 and in Bill 119, is basically, in my view, a total farce. We have added hospitals and the environment as the recipients of funds not because they are going to be the recipients of funds but because they help us to market more lottery tickets. It helps us to sell more lottery tickets, to put it in that big pot I talked about, which is the general revenue fund, and indeed then the Treasurer will decide who gets what. But we are going through this façade in order that we can market more lottery tickets.

Hon Mr Black: You are such a cynic, Mike. You never think positively about anything, always negatively.

1550

Mr Farnan: The minister has interjected, and I have great respect for the minister, and he suggested that I am speaking negatively to this subject. With all due respect, I want to say to the minister I think I have attempted to be as constructive as I possibly can in this debate. I have said to him I will support his bill. I suggested I would support the bill, and I am providing the kinds of amendments that I can support the bill with. The amendments are not negative amendments.

I hope the minister is not suggesting that providing treatment for pathological gamblers is a negative suggestion. I would suggest that is very positive. If I am suggesting a guarantee of income for culture, parks and recreation. I would suggest, Mr Speaker, to the minister through you, that that is a very positive manner in which to look at preventive health care in the province of Ontario.

Because I have great respect for the minister I will take that remark of his as a moment in which he just spoke with some indiscretion. So I remain faithful to what I said yesterday. I do have trust in this minister. I do believe him when he says that he is concerned about gambling, and when he says that to me in private, I do believe it implies two things: (1) that he recognizes pathological gambling is a problem, and (2) he is going to do something about it. I hope he is going to take my suggestion that a very small portion—0.5%—of lottery profits would be designated for that purpose.

To return to this issue of supporting culture, recreation, sports, etc, I want to look at the language of the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act. Bill 119 and Bill 114 do nothing to change the language, but I want to give members the significant phrases. This is what the bill says. All of the money that comes in "shall be paid"—that is strong language—"into the consolidated revenue fund." So now we know that all the money coming in goes into the fund.

Now what does it say about sports, culture and recreation? What funding will they get? It says "at such times...as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may direct, to be available for appropriation by the Legislature" sums for these areas. "May direct, to be available" is very much weaker language than "shall be available." The rest of the money that is not used for sports, culture, recreation and the Trillium Foundation, and now under Bill 114 for the environment, what does it say about that? It "shall be applied to...hospitals."

If we were to take the Treasurer's commitment to sports, culture and recreation at its face value, \$120 million, and subtract it from the overall profits of lotteries, we are talking about \$380 million left. There is no guarantee of where it is going. It is simply going into the pot.

What kind of a tax are lotteries? The minister now is shaking his head and I am not sure whether to understand by his

body language that he disagrees with me that lotteries are a tax. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that any way in which government raises a dollar is a tax. If it raises it through personal income tax, if it raises it through sales tax, if it raises it through lotteries, that is a tax.

It is a fact that those individuals who have a lower income spend a greater percentage of their income on lottery purchases than those who have a middle or upper income. They do not spend more money on lottery tickets; they spend a greater percentage of their earnings on lottery tickets. So basically what the government is saying is that the group of people in our society who are in the low-income earning group, as opposed to the middle- and upper-income earning group, are spending a greater percentage of their income on lottery tickets. It is not unreasonable that they are going to buy lottery tickets. As a group, we are spending a lot of money.

I would like the minister, if he is responding to my remarks, to give me one piece of information. I would ask him to indicate to the House how much money is spent by this government advertising lotteries through its staff, through its salaries to staff and through newspapers and radio and television. It would be an interesting statistic to know how much money is allocated, because you have to invest so much money in order to reap the profit. Certainly the advertising of the lotteries in Ontario is extremely aggressive; it is extremely well done; it is very clever; it is very smooth. It could not be a better operation if the sole purpose is to generate funds; if the sole purpose is to separate people from their money.

As I have suggested to you, Mr Speaker, it is impossible to enter a corner grocery store, it is impossible for people to go to buy a newspaper, a packet of cigarettes, bread, milk, whatever you like, without having in front of them the opportunity to buy a lottery ticket. It is impossible, if at the same time these people are being inundated with very seductive advertising, which says: "You can break out of your poverty cycle. It's as close to you as the purchase of a \$2 lottery ticket."

Of course, the government is so clever that it keeps bringing you back, because on some of the lottery tickets now there is an additional number at the bottom. For an extra \$1 you can have this extra number at the bottom of your ticket. If you have noticed the government advertising, it says, "Well, if you don't buy it, you don't have a chance to win." So there is the dream being presented to you, and the government is saying, "Hey, if you want the dream, you've got to pay for it." It is not surprising that people at the lower end of the income scale in Ontario are attracted by this dream.

If your life is tough, if you have real problems footing the bill, if you have real problems trying to keep a balanced diet on the table for your kids, clothing your kids, paying the bills, financial problems, struggling from week to week, and then this dream is presented to you that with the purchase of a lottery ticket it is going to be a whole different new world; it is going to be heaven; it is going to be the cars and the boats and the rich lifestyle. The ministry promotes that. It promotes the dream and it makes the dream totally accessible. No matter where one goes, one can buy the tickets. It is that close.

The point I want to make to the members is that for most of us purchasing a lottery ticket is not a problem. I purchase a lottery ticket, as I said yesterday, maybe once every couple of weeks. Occasionally, I might buy them a couple of days in a row. It might be three months before I buy another one. Buying lottery tickets is not a problem for me, but there are people who budget for their lottery ticket because that is part of their dream: "We'll put \$5 aside each week." But desperation leads on to

say, "Well, gee, you know, if I put \$10 aside," and then, "Mrs Murphy in town, she won \$25,000. Well, gosh, you know, maybe if I go to \$15 a week or \$20 a week...."

1600

All the members of this House have to do, I would suggest, is stand beside one of the outlets in the mall and watch the kind of money being deposited to ask themselves if pathological gamblers are not involved. Pathological gamblers, as I said before, are not easy to pick out. They do not stagger; they do not smell; they are not puking up over you. Basically, they look very normal, but they have the disease. I am saying to all my colleagues we have to very seriously consider what we are going to do about it.

It is a tax, but it is a tax for which it is possible that some people, because of the disease, will put their own lives and the lives of their families and friends at risk. We do not have one clinic in Ontario. It is time that we did.

When this goes, I believe, to the committee of the whole House, I am going to present the amendments I have suggested. The minister has left at this stage, but I do simply want to make an appeal to him. I do not know where this legislation is going to go. The government has not been flexible in the past when we dealt with Bill 119. I have little reason to suspect that it will be any more flexible in dealing with Bill 114.

Hon Mr Black: I am always flexible.

Mr Farnan: I want to say to the minister, who has just remarked publicly in the House that he is always flexible, that indeed there is no room for flexibility here, there is a demand, a need for people who are suffering from a disease, who have no treatment in Ontario or all of Canada and who are being sent to the United States for treatment. This minister is bringing in \$500 million in revenue from gambling, from the sale of lottery tickets.

I believe we have a responsibility to address this need in our society and I want the minister, whatever happens, to take this issue to cabinet, to talk to the Minister of Health and to work diligently and vigorously on behalf of those who suffer from the disease of pathological gambling.

There are many other areas I did want to speak to, but the way the debate is structured today in order to allow my colleague the member for Hamilton Mountain and a member for the Conservative Party to make their statements, at this stage I have to basically leave out some of the remarks which perhaps I can add at a later date.

I want to thank you, Mr Speaker, for the order you brought to this debate. Before I sit down, and I say this most sincerely, I have listened to the debate over the last couple of days and at times this House was extremely wrangy. There was a lot of back-and-forth banter that was going on, but during the period of time when I discussed the problem of pathological gambling, I want to say that the members of this House listened with great attention, and I am very grateful for that. I say that to all my colleagues in every party.

The issue is so significant, so important, it cries out to be addressed, and there are people out there—maybe they are watching this, maybe not—whose lives are literally destroyed by gambling. Their wives, husbands and families, their lives are being destroyed. There are suicides as a result of this. That is why I appreciate the attention that was given to my discussion of this issue by all parties. I hope the attention that has been given reflects the seriousness and the commitment of government members and opposition to do something about it.

Let's put a percentage of funds from lotteries to provide treatment for the pathological gambler. Let's do that. Let's address the need.

Mr Fleet: I would like to make a couple of comments. First of all, I think the honourable member was correct that there is a concern about any person who suffers from some kind of an addiction, whether it is gambling or anything else, but there was not much else I agreed with in terms of the tenor of some of the comments about Bill 119, in particular, a committee I sat on, and I heard the kinds of submissions that were made, as did the honourable member for Cambridge.

I think it would be useful if we just reiterate what the current legislation says, what it said with Bill 119, and what it is going to say after Bill 114 is dealt with. That is simply that physical fitness, sports, recreational and cultural facilities, as well as now the Ontario Trillium Foundation, have first claim on lottery proceeds.

What we said with Bill 119 was that hospital funding should be included, and now with Bill 114 the protection of the environment should be included. The honourable member is clearly confused. He calls the process of voluntarily buying a lottery ticket a tax. Clearly, he misunderstands the nature of a democracy when people make voluntary choices. He is fearful, indeed—quite surprisingly—he is fearful that somebody with perhaps not a large income might buy a lottery ticket.

We think that democracy is a good thing and if people want to buy a lottery ticket, so be it. We think there are a lot of public support for protection of the environment. I certainly find it in my riding and elsewhere around the province, and I do not think it is helpful that people might be fearful about that process.

Lastly, I commend the Treasurer for coming to the legislative committee on Bill 119 and making a commitment about guaranteed funding out of lottery proceeds for fitness and recreational purposes of a minimum—I add the word “minimum”—of \$120 million a year for three years starting last year. It is highly commendable.

Mr Farnan: I just want to make one small point in talking about the tenor of the debate.

The member who just made a statement said culture, recreation, sports, etc would, under this legislation, have first claim on the lottery funds. That is true; they will have first claim. The problem is it does not say what their claim will be. That is the problem. Because under this particular act—I am not saying the government is going to do this, but the way the legislation is structured—the government could give \$1 to all of culture, sports, recreation, etc and nothing else, and it would meet the commitments of this act. They could use every other dollar for everything else.

I am saying that lotteries were designated and they were introduced originally to address the needs of sports, culture, recreation and fitness. That was the designation. They have been more successful than we ever dreamed they would be, and all we are saying is, fine, use the profits for a variety of other areas, but give a guarantee—not first claim on—a guarantee of one third of the total profits to those areas for which lotteries were first introduced.

That, I think, is a reasonable statement to make. I am not going to comment on some of the other inflammatory remarks made by the member, because to give them the dignity of a response would be unworthy of me. Therefore I do want to suggest that I am sorry the member did mention pathological gambling and support for that issue.

1610

Mr Cousens: Bill 114 is being carried by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Is that not odd? Here it is, an environmental change, and the Minister of the Environment is not even here. What I see happening now is that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation can set up a tour to 10 places in the province so that when he is talking about tourism—and here he is now becoming the environmentalist. Maybe he can take them by Hagersville and look at the burnt tires and say: “Now there’s something we did with your tax money. We took the tire tax and there’s what we didn’t do with it. Here’s just what we’ve got and there are long-term ramifications to it. Yes, we in Ontario are going to take you on a tour of another spot. Let’s go and look at some fresh water in Elmira. We’ve got some water here. Don’t drink it, but you can look at it.”

You can do that with a lot of water in Ontario, and not all of us are sure just what water to drink or not to drink any more. But the Minister of Tourism and Recreation will take us on a tour of the places to see.

He can take them up my way in York region and look at the Keele Valley dump site and look at the expansion that the Ministry of the Environment is looking at to double it and expand it. All it is trying to do is sort of go beyond the expectations that site had originally and ever would have. The whole impact that it is having, not only in that community, in the riding of York Centre, Vaughan and south York region, is such that here we have another example of not managing our waste. We are ending up filling it up. It is coming from all over the province now.

Take the people who come to Ontario. The tourists will have a chance to see something the government is not doing anything about, and the minister comes forward with a bill that says: “Oh, hey, aren’t we good in environment? We’ve added another few words to the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act to show that we are very much environmentalists.”

Take the people on a tour of what the government is not doing. Keele Valley is certainly one of the sites to look at. Take them up to Tiny Township and look at Pauzé dump up there and watch. It is too bad they cannot climb down and join the leachate and see how it is expanding through into the ground.

Members have places to take people in Ontario. They can take them over to Whitevale. They really had something good to see there when they went and had a monument made for the Premier of the province, drawing attention to what he is doing, exempting the regional municipalities from the Environmental Assessment Act and using the Environmental Protection Act. That is something the government could tour people through and give them an insight into what is going on over in Whitevale.

Indeed, each of the regional municipalities is trying to do its thing, and yet this government really does not know how to walk people through the truthful way. The minister could have them take a little river tour down the Don River or the Humber. As their Minister of Tourism and Recreation, he can show them how proud he is of the smut, the dirt, the things that are around in there. He has something to be proud of. Here he is bringing forward a bill, he is so proud he is doing something, but it is not much to be proud of. The tour of the garbage and the problems that this government continues to forget about is a tour he should take himself. He should have a look at the Don River and the Humber, go and look at the beaches in and around Toronto in the summertime, realize how people cannot swim there any more because there are storm sewers and whenever

there is a big storm, they flush out everything else and they contaminate the whole beach.

Sure thing, the minister is doing an awful lot by making a small change to a lottery bill and make the world think this is a government that is environmentally concerned. I have not heard such a pile of rubbish, because what he is doing is failing to look at the rubbish that he is continuing to support around this province.

He should have a look at what Ontario Hydro has done. There are lots of points. There are tours he could take around the Toronto area. We could take him out to the Lakeview area to have a look at the emissions that are coming out from Lakeview and some of these other places. His government has not even begun to act on it, yet he is going to be taking big credit with all the environmentalists: "Look how we've done something here."

How about taking some people, when they come on a tour of the province, to Muskoka? I think the minister comes from there, when he goes back up there to get elected, and probably every weekend. But when he finally gets them through all the traffic problems on Highway 400 to get to Muskoka, there is an example of a municipality that does not have a place to put its garbage. Mind you, they might send some of it down to Toronto, but the fact is that the people of Muskoka have a problem. They have a serious problem.

I just got some extra advice from my honourable friend the member for Mississauga South. She just happens to agree with the fact that we have a problem with 100 municipalities, and we could put each of those 100 municipalities on the list of places that have a garbage problem.

When the member is on his tour of the province as Minister of Tourism and Recreation he should drop around to Temagami and just show them the no-cutting plans. There are a lot of people interested in the environment, and the tourists who come into Ontario might be quite shocked yet very surprised that here out of one side of our mouths we are saying, "We've got a lot to see." I will tell members, there is a lot to see that they do not want to see and that I do not want to see any more.

The minister should have a little look at the riding of Hastings-Peterborough and have a look at what is going on in Mar-mora, where we have a huge quarry site, a situation where there was a mine, and that is becoming a potential dump site. There are 10 different places I just took off the top of my head as places that the minister could come along and look at, all part of the lie that Ontario is a leader in the environment. We are not a leader in the environment.

I am really pleased at some of the things that private enterprise is doing. In fact, the Royal Bank Reporter has just released an issue called "Conserve and Protect." It is their environment issue. I want to quote from some of the things that are very salient to this issue of the environment. They begin, in one of their key articles, entitled "Waste Not, Want Not"—and this should be mandatory reading for everyone in government and just about everyone in the province of Ontario—"North Americans, who make up only 8% of the world's population, are responsible for 50% of the garbage." We make up 8% of the world's population, yet—do you believe it?—50% of the garbage in the world comes out of North America.

"On a per capita basis, which two countries produce the most garbage and consume the most energy?" Put on your thinking cap. This is a \$64,000 question.

Mr Pelissero: And the answer is?

Mr Cousens: The answer is Canada and the United States.

They go on to say, "Indeed, it has been said that Canada, with a population of 26 million, has as much impact on the environment as India, whose population numbers 800 million."

We have a growing and serious problem with the environment, and I have just the very terrible feeling that the minister, in his very proud introduction to the bill, feels that he has now done his bit to protect the environment by adding the words under the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, "for the protection of the environment." I have to say it is nice, but it does not really amount to a hill of beans when we look at all that has to be done for the world to begin to understand the importance and the urgency to protect the environment over the long term.

I sense that people in Ontario and around the world who have come to understand some of the problems that we are creating ourselves. More and more people are beginning to believe that we are in serious danger of destroying the world environment. We are doing it to ourselves. We are doing it with the way we are destroying the atmosphere, the ozone layer, our rivers and our valley system and the way we are taking away the swamp land and hurting wildlife. There is just no end to the number of things we are doing as human beings to destroy, destroy, destroy.

1620

Mr Velshi: What about the Rouge?

Mr Cousens: The Rouge is a good example. It took a long, long time.

Mr Pelissero: What was the recent announcement about the Rouge? Tell us about the Rouge.

Mr Cousens: If the member wants to talk about the Rouge, this is no government that can stand up and be proud. I am not too pleased with the federal government and what it is doing with the GST or the way it is handling some of its other problems. It was not just one person. Pauline Browes, the federal member for Scarborough Centre, was able to get \$10 million to start the Rouge. How long did it take this government to wake up to the fact it was going to lose the \$10 million and there would not be any money at all coming from the federal government? Miss Browes happens to be a very strong and influential Tory in Ottawa. I wish there were more like her; then we would have more money coming into the environment. We need to have that kind of strength to protect the environment at all times.

Mr Fleet: You just want to have the GST come in so you can tax the people of Ontario.

Mr Cousens: I think I am getting them upset. They will have a chance to speak, if I give them one.

The Speaker: Do you feel you have been successful?

Mr Cousens: I think I have. It is feeding time, is it not?

Mr Pelissero: Feeding or breeding?

Mr Cousens: I would not want to breed any more like that. They start to make a little bit of noise. Throw them another fish.

We in Ontario are looking for leadership out of this government on environmental matters because it is a fundamental concern to people. I know the government has polls. It lives by them, it works by them, it reads them, it pays for them. Surely the polls are telling the government, because I can read about them in the public papers, that environment is becoming the number one issue. It certainly is in my riding in Markham, as people are saying to me: "What are we going to do about the environment? How can we protect it over the long term?"

We in Ontario have an opportunity to be world leaders. If we are going to be world leaders, we are going to have to do an awful lot more than just have a little change in the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act for the protection of the environment because the government is saying, "We will be able to put \$20 million or \$30 million into the environment." I will come to that later because I do not think there is anything close to \$20 million or \$30 million that is going to go into the environment from the lottery funds that are about to be spent.

The second attitude that is really strong with people is that the government has to begin to take very serious action against pollution, even if it means closing down factories, putting people in jail or causing some people to be unhappy with it. We are unhappy with this group of Liberals for a heap of reasons. One of the reasons I am unhappy with them has to do with the lack of focus on environmental issues. If they were really serious about it, there would be some action taken to make sure that there were teeth in the law and that people who are going to break the law are not going to be out on the street the next day to do it again and again.

We have to take it seriously. The government has to take very seriously the attitude that people have now. We as Canadians can set an example for the world and do something to fight pollution. When you can come along and have it said that North Americans, and ourselves among them, are among the highest perpetrators, developers, contributors of garbage, that is not one of the traits I want to be known as having around the world.

The third point I want to make on the attitudes to the environment is that people should pay the full environmental cost of products and services they consume. There has to be far more interest in people when they are making purchases to say: "I wonder where this was manufactured? Does that company or that organization have environmental standards that have a long-term effect on the environment that could be negative?" I am worried about what is going to happen with the Third World countries and the opening up in Europe of new industrialization as companies from North America take their plants and move over there and start manufacturing.

Will they manufacture with the same kind of environmental guidelines in those countries as we have over here? I venture to say they will not, because at this point in time they will just be glad to get the investment so that they can start manufacturing and having jobs. Over a period of time they will then bring in the kind of environmental controls and safeguards that we have, but right now if you want to manufacture in Mexico or Czechoslovakia or Romania or India, you are not going to have the kind of environmental controls that are part and parcel of our society and of working and living and manufacturing in Canada. So we in Canada, when we purchase things, should be very sensitive to the fact if this was manufactured elsewhere by a company that says it is a strong North American company. Are we going to be looking into the background and saying: "Hey, that is not being manufactured in the country. That company is not having to live by the same environmental standards and controls that are present here, and it is just getting around our environmental guidelines by manufacturing over there."

We have to be sensitive as people who are buying and saying, "Hey, I want to make sure that what I buy has been manufactured or built or developed by people who have a similar sensitivity to the environment." We have, as consumers and as a government and as human beings, to begin to set an honest example as to what it is that we care about. I will tell

members, if we care about the environment, when we consume things we should be far more careful in what we are doing.

One, I believe that drastic changes are required, far more than this bill which is being touted by the government as a significant attempt to advance environmental issues. I think we have to proceed to have far more policing of what is going on and damaging the environment.

Two, we have to be far more concerned about putting money in, where we can as a government give leadership to make sure that the research and the development is going on to ensure that people are being guided out of the environmental problem areas and into areas in which they can have a way of participating positively.

I believe every ministry, every company, every one of us, should have some kind of policy that we are following that says we are environmentally involved, we are charged up with the responsibility of being environmentalists. It is not going to be just the member for Mississauga South who is the environmentalist in the Legislature, but every one of us can stand up and be counted as people who believe in the green.

I do not have confidence in the present Minister of Tourism and Recreation that he is the environmentalist that this bill is going to try to make him. The fact of the matter is, I do not think this lottery funding that the government is going to set aside will begin to do the job.

How much will come out of it? I think some of the estimates indicate that it could be up to \$20 million that comes out of it. If that is the case, with the increase in money that is coming into the lottery corporation, that is going to be far in excess of what has been there before. I would like to know how that money is going to be spent, where is it going to be directed and who is going to control the direction of it. Is it going to come through the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, who is going to then say, "Well, now, how are we going to spend this money?"

I know that the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay has to have some sensitivity, but I would not like to see the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay be the fellow who says, "Here is how we are going to spend our environmental pot this year." Let's realize first of all, he will not get his hands on the money, because it is not going into his own pot anyway; it is going into the great, big pot of the government. It is going to be like all the other money that those guys collect from us. It is just going to go in the big pot and then the Treasurer and Minister of Economics, in his budget, will find ways of allocating it.

It is like the fishermen. We had the Minister of Natural Resources in yesterday and we were talking about our fishing licences. The money that people now pay for a fishing licence does not necessarily go for building fisheries and hatcheries and replenishing the supply of fish in our lakes and streams because it goes into the great big pot. If a person was paying a licence for that and knew that it was going for the replenishment of our fish and stocks, then he would be inclined to feel, "All right, that is a tax we can live with; it's got a purpose to it." But all it is is another tax. It is not really a licence for it. They come along and they charge you and fine you if you do not have it, but the money has been put in the great big pot of the Treasurer of Ontario and is not necessarily applied to those areas that we want.

That is the same with this environmental fund that the government is going to have out of the lottery corporation. Instead of really saying, "There it is, a pot of gold for an environmental purpose," it might be a scholarship, it might be some special R and D things, it could be a host of things, far more the

\$20 million is going to do. But I will tell members, there are going to be huge press releases and announcements when something happens with this money, not unlike the announcements that the government made when it set up its technology fund and said, "Half a billion dollars is going to be spent on promoting high technology, \$100 million a year." How much has been spent over the past three years? A bag of shells. Just \$20 million or \$30 million, nothing close to the hundreds of millions that were promised.

1630

I do not see anything that is coming forward in this legislation or in the actions of this minister or this government that tells me that the people who participate in the lotteries for the environment are going to actually see this money go back in to protect our futures.

This government is classic in saying, "Well, we're going to take this money and it's going to go to this purpose." They did that with the tire tax. The tire tax was going to do something about it, but they did not get around to doing it and we have Hagersville to prove it. By the time Hagersville happened, the minister was not even around to pay attention to it—and I just cannot believe that the Minister of Environment is not even here to take part in this debate and to be involved with it.

Hon Mr Black: He is in the hospital.

Mr Cousens: Someone tells me he is in the hospital. Well, I hope he is feeling better. That is probably the best reason to be away. Have we done it to him, or is it something else? I hope he is okay. If he is watching, I hope he gets well soon and comes back here so we can beat him up. In the meantime, I hope he has a good recovery.

Where is his parliamentary assistant for the Environment minister? Is he here, or she? Mr Speaker, on an environmental issue, you would expect—

The Speaker: Order. It is not question period, but I would just like to remind the member—there have been a few other occasions when I have reminded members—that it is up to the members individually to be here or not be here and it is not really tradition to refer to members as missing.

Mr Cousens: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I appreciate that.

The problem we have is that we are seeing a government that is very good on the window dressing and on the facade. We are seeing a government that says, "Oh, we are really involved with the environment." Some of the people who will look at that have to understand that we are just getting window dressing here, as we got it with Hagersville.

Hagersville is proof that the government took the tire tax and what did it do with it? They did not even have a plan for it. It goes into the big pot or the general revenues of the province and does not really go out there to assist and support and help the problems with tires that exist.

The examples go on: the Ontario employer health levy—what an example—where this government has another form of taxation. One of the constituents in my riding just in the past couple of days called me in tremendous dismay at the dishonesty he felt was being exemplified by the way this government has introduced the employer health levy.

It is just an unbelievably bad situation where the government is saying, "Hey, we're now going to cover the cost of health care." This employer previously had a 50-50 deal with his employees in covering their OHIP. He would pay 50 per cent of the costs and they would pay 50 per cent of the remain-

ing costs. Some were covered by other employers, their spouses or someone, and he would not have to pay those costs. His costs last year were \$50,000. This year his costs to cover the employer health levy are going to be \$200,000, cutting right into his own revenues.

This is a government that says, "Oh, we're covering it for you." Meanwhile they have the professional people free of having to pay it. Do lawyers have to pay the employer health levy? Do accountants have to pay the employer health levy? We have the public relations experts that come out from this government who somehow convey to the people of Ontario, "We're doing it right for you."

When they come out and say that they are doing it right for us on the environment, it is probably no different from the way they have done everything else that they have touched. When they have gone in and touched those issues that I am talking about, such as the tire tax, such as the fishing tax, such as the employer health levy—it is like the parents I know who took their children's education fund and instead of spending it on the children's education spent it on themselves. It is a tragic situation.

I know of a family where the parents were having some money and all the way along their children were assuming that what the parents had said was true, that that money was being set aside for their education and when they went off to college or university, or whatever they were going to do, that money would be there for them. These parents I know took that money and spent it on themselves. Then when the children went to go to university, it was not there.

I have that same sense of heartbreak when I look at this government taking money for an environmental purpose. It is not going to be in one pot like the education fund that a child or a young person would need to go on to university. Instead, it is going into the large pot of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics, and at some appropriate time—probably during an election campaign—the government will make some announcement as to how it is going to spend that money.

It might be accumulated for three or four years, and then when the election is coming along, the government says, "Now we have a chance to use this money to help the Liberal ridings that we are going to win." Maybe at that point they can identify some special crusades that they can help with. If I am lucky in Markham, I might get just a few pennies. Then I will have to be grateful, and I will be, but the fact is that I do not have a sense that this government is going to be doing it fairly, equitably or in a timely way, nor is it going to be doing it for the right reasons all the time.

The environment has to become a crusade for this government. It should not be just one of those little things that they set aside and say, "Hey, aren't we doing a great job?" I have the abysmal, deep, horrible feeling that the government is not truly committed to the environment the way it should be or the way it said it would be when it was elected back in 1987. What we really have to have is some consistency of program, some involvement in the issue, so that we are beginning to be solvers of the problem and not just people who are creating an even worse problem.

The statistics I started out with from the Royal Bank, of waste not, want not—we are a wasteful society. We in government have a chance to give leadership about it. I just cannot say enough on how poor the leadership has been on environmental matters, and it is exemplified by what this government is doing with this bill. The government is coming along and just saying, "Here is another little pot and we are setting it aside."

When you look at the concerns that were expressed when Bill 119 was brought forward, the people who were doing something for parks and recreation were saying, "What is going to happen to our programs?" People have traditionally looked for something in parks and recreation. Is that going to take a lesser place now? What is going to happen with cultural programs now that the pot is going to be further spread out? What is going to happen with the Trillium Foundation now that you have got health and environment issues? And then, how much of the money is not spent anyway?

When the minister is giving his response I would be interested in knowing how much—

Hon Mr Black: If we ever get a chance.

Mr Cousens: The minister will have his chance. This is a democratic system, and we always make sure that you get your chance because the Speaker guarantees it, the system insures it. The minister will be the last person to speak and he will be able to come back and isolate two or three of my remarks and everybody else's remarks, mock them and make fun of them, sidestep the issue and not deal with the fact that we are very, very upset that here is the Minister of Tourism and Recreation bringing forward an environmental change and really not having anything to do with it beyond that; not really being involved with it as an environmentalist should be. Maybe he will have a conversion and become an environmentalist. Maybe the Minister of Tourism and Recreation should take a few lessons on that.

I am concerned that what this government is doing is making all the pots smaller and not saying, "Here is the commitment that this government is going to make on the environment." It is going to take more than the \$20 million—if it is that much; and I doubt if it is going to be anything close to \$20 million that is going to be able to be spent on the environment out of the lottery fund, because there is not going to be that amount in there.

Will the minister guarantee it? Not a chance. If it is going to be \$4 million or \$5 million—could the minister tell us how much of the money, if it is put in the pot from the environmental lotteries, is really going to be spent on the environment? How much is going to come in and is it going to be spent within a certain period of time? Will he commit that it is going to be spent within six months or a year of it being in his pot, or is he just going to spend the interest and hold on to the principal?

Come on. This government has a great way of being magical with the words and then moving things around and you really do not know what is there. I do not think we are going to have a public accounting of how much money is really going to be in the pot for the environment. In fact, what worries me is that we continue to undermine other good programs and then we put up the window dressing on a program like this and say, "Hey, now we have got a problem solved." This government has not solved the problem of the environment.

1640

Just try to outline any of the big problems that I listed earlier in the tour that the minister could take people on: Hagersville, Elmira, Keele Valley, Pauzé dump, Whitevale, the Don River, the Humber, Lake Ontario, the Lakeview site, the 100 municipalities without garbage dumps, Temagami, Marmora. There are so many examples where this government is going down and taking the province with it. Then it is beginning to make us think that this is the solution.

What we really have to do is go back to the attitudes that the people of the province are trying to convey to us as members of this Legislature. Let's see what we can do so that we do not have a Bhopal. When you think of the tragedy there of 2,000 blinded people—could it happen here? We just do not know. Are we talking about a Chernobyl at some point? We hope not, but it is going on in other parts of the world. Are we talking about the Love Canal? How many secret Love Canals are there around the province? What about the PCB problem? Has it gone away in Ontario? I do not think so. What about St Bruno School and the asbestos? Has that gone away? Is everything solved? What other schools are contaminated with asbestos?

What we have to do is accept the fact that as members of the Legislature we should be giving direction for solutions on environmental matters that show that we are leaders in the environment and prepared to make a significant commitment that says we are willing to stand up and be counted, we are willing to bring legislation in that is going to say: "Here is the money that's going to go towards these and these are the goals that we see as important. This is what we as a government are really going to stand for on environmental issues. Here is our position on Temagami, here is how the money from your lottery funds are going to help other things."

It is a matter of having a comprehensive picture that understands the subliminal and deep and true attitudes of the people in our province who are saying: "This is an issue, and it's not the second or third issue we want to see looked after. We want to see our government taking leadership in the environment."

It is a call-to-action time. If the total amount of action that is being taken by the government is one to bring in a lottery bill that is going to sort of sign it through, I just wish I could support it. The principle in itself is sound, to be able to say we are going to be doing something. But what are they going to do with it? When are they going to do it? How is it going to be managed? Is it going to happen in time? Is there a real sense of purpose to what this government is doing? It is not there, it is not here.

When I look around and see the interest that is being taken by the Minister of the Environment, when I see the casual nature of it all, I have to say that we in Ontario have a major problem. Here is the Minister of Tourism and Recreation is coming cloaked as an environmentalist with his lottery change, and I can see his newsletter going out to the people of Muskoka, "There is another change that I did." They still will not have a garbage dump in Muskoka. They will still be sending it somewhere else.

That is the problem. Deal with the real issues, deal with them in a way that has integrity and honesty to it. Do not come along here in the House and say, "Well now, haven't we done something?" The minister has done something, but at the expense of what? And when is he going to do it?

I do not know really where to begin or end on the issue. As I talk about the issue and as I feel a tremendous sense of importance around it, I just know that the government will stand judged on its failure to take the environment seriously. It will be able to get a few points, but not many, for the change in the lottery act.

People who do not understand that it is going to be less money for some of the other things that are required in our community will not really know that now there may be less money for sports and fitness and culture and the Ontario Trillium Foundation and some of those needs which were really the beginning of why the Ontario Lottery Corp could justify itself.

People are still going to buy their lottery tickets and the minister will make it interesting and he will make it fun for them. I just do not get a thrill out of the fact that he is giving us the false assumption that he is now going to be doing something very, very significant of an environmental nature.

We have a problem with this bill. I know that the member for Mississauga South will be bringing in amendments in a very substantial way, trying to change this so that there can be a special fund established. I referred to that earlier. It is the very problem with fishing licences and the employer health tax, allowing it to just go into the general revenues of the government and allowing the Treasurer to get his hands on it. Who really knows what is going to happen then?

The other problem is just that a minimum of 35% of the net total profits appropriated shall be used to encourage the acquisition, conservation—

The Speaker: Order. A point of order.

Hon Mr Black: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am a very patient man and I have been listening to the member for Markham as he has gone on for several minutes now, but there is a limit beyond which he should not go. He suggests that the Treasurer is going to be doing something behind the scenes, undercover, and that to me is an attack on the Treasurer's honesty. I want the member to realize and to recognize, as he well knows, that the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act requires a public accounting in the public accounts committee—

The Speaker: Order. I listened very carefully to the alleged point of order. On many occasions—in fact I expect on all occasions—members express their own points of view. The member for Markham is now expressing his point of view. I am sure the minister will have an opportunity to express his point of view. The member for Markham may have something further.

Mr Cousens: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and I congratulate you on the way you have just spoken to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I happen to agree with you immensely on the way in which you have done that.

I think it just has to do with my own sense of worry that when the Treasurer touches money that is tagged for the environment, and it could have been tagged specifically in this bill, then we, on our side, would have felt that it would certainly have gone there—during elections, for sure. That is when those guys are going to be spending the money. But at least it would happen.

I would like to wrap up and give others an opportunity to speak on this bill. I am concerned that this government has not begun to face up to the environmental responsibility it has been given and that what we are seeing here today is just a further example of its failure to do something serious about it. Is it \$20 million we are going to have? Will it be spent within the next year? Has the government really made that commitment to the environment, or is it just more window dressing? I fear that is what this is: more window dressing from the Ontario Liberal government.

When the Minister of Tourism and Recreation comes along and looks over his great record of achievement, is this going to count as one of those great big things that he did? History will tell us an awful lot of what I have said. The money will not be there, it will not be spent and it will not be doing what he said it would, because he never really put it in a place where it could happen that way.

I know he is going to win the public relations battle, because he has got such a large staff to get out there and start

telling people what a good job he is doing. But the people who watch this live and might read Hansard are going to know that there is not just total agreement in this House on the way this government is handling the environment, and we who are concerned about the environment are looking to people like the member for Mississauga South to continue to give that kind of leadership, so that the minister and the government might become a little more honest in what they are doing.

Mr Faubert: I am aware that the opposition's role is to oppose and I know the standing orders do not allow me to use the word "misrepresent" in reference to another honourable member's remarks, so I will not use that, but I would like the debate and the Hansard of this debate to reflect reality.

I would first like to point out to the member for Markham, as you pointed out earlier, Mr Speaker, that it is a custom in this House not to comment on a particular member's absence. In this case, for the record, the Minister of the Environment happens to be in the hospital with a detached retina. That perhaps is one of the problems of certain members of the opposition. I think their actual research is suspect.

I would actually like to congratulate the member for Cambridge, because there is one area which he did raise, aside from all the others, a particular issue which I think should be of concern to us. The act before us is not an act on culture, as everyone seems to think. Partly it is an act on the environment, but it is an Act to amend the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act.

1650

He raises the issue of compulsive gambling or pathological gambling. I think it is a problem that anyone who has any connection with it recognizes as an addiction, but not always necessarily for the reasons that he put forward. The figures he uses are somewhat suspect, and also the fact that he keeps saying it is the poor who are trapped in this area of pathological gambling. It simply is not a fact. It is not true. Anyone who has done any research on this knows that the middle class and the upper middle class are as addicted to gambling in many cases as the poor. The great thing about pathological gambling is that it has nothing to do with the return on gambling; it has to do with the action of gambling. That is what the person becomes addicted to, not indeed money.

With regard to the US studies that he quotes, I always look with great suspicion on someone who utilizes United States studies and attempts to extrapolate them into Canada, because as everyone knows, we have much different socioeconomic bases. Trying to take those figures and apply them to Canada should be suspect. He also admitted very clearly that there are no conclusions and the quid pro quo of the studies he put forward cannot show an actual reason for pathological gambling.

I think what he talks about is valid, but I think perhaps the best approach would be something I think will be addressed by the minister, and that is to look at a more logical Canadian study related to pathological gambling. I think this would be the best way of going. I have been to many conferences on gaming and state revenues.

Mr Charlton: Let's take some of the lottery revenue to have a study done. Let's take the first \$2.5 million.

Mr Faubert: One of the things that perhaps we can do is along this line. I think we have to look specifically at the reasoning behind it. The numbers are actually there. The great problem with all the studies that have been done is the very low threshold in interpretation of what is a pathological gambler. If anyone reads those studies, he will recognize that, because they

are statistically suspect from the source that prepared them. If you look at some of those studies, they have been done by establishments, religious groups or clinics that actually treat compulsive gamblers, and therefore one has to understand why the figures are inflated within them.

I would tell the member for Cambridge that on the basis of what he is bringing forward, I would support any study or any proposal that we put forward for a Canadian study in this area. I do not support his amendment and I will leave the minister to deal with that one a little further.

I point to the opposition in another area, and that is that they keep saying that somehow this bill is our answer to dealing with the problems of the environment. Obviously it is not. We know it is not to resolve or to pay for all environmental programs of this government, but it is to raise additional revenues. That is the object of the bill, to allow us to be able to bring forward a lottery that is specifically geared to the environment.

To say that this is the be-all and end-all, that this is to resolve all, is entirely wrong. We know it is simply to supplement the many successful programs that have been put forward and that have been taken and implemented by what I consider—and not just myself and not just the members of this caucus but many people—the best Minister of the Environment in the history of this province. He has shown leadership in every single aspect of the environment within this province.

One of the things I think the minister will also do in his windup is clarify the intent of the bill. I will leave him to do that. But one of the things I wanted to clarify in my remarks, and I am probably looking for another five minutes to do so, is that on Tuesday 29 May the member for Halton North, as Chairman of the committee on Bill 119, raised a particular issue relating to this, a criticism that a number of members who have spoken to this were talking about. He said very clearly that all the people who appeared before the committee on Bill 119 were not in opposition to Bill 119. For some reason, that was extrapolated by certain members—I believe the member for Simcoe East for one and the member for Nickel Belt for another—who said to him that they must have been at a different committee.

Well, I happened to be at that committee and I also know some of those members and the actual attendance at that, because I was there for every single day of hearing of that committee. I would like to point out, from my perspective, what the member for Halton North was alluding to. After the committee hearings, both he as Chair and I as Vice-Chair, received both calls and letters, from many people who appeared before that committee, thanking us for two things: for the courtesy that was shown them at that committee and for the explanations that were given to them about the bill and a better understanding of what the government intended by the bill. I think that would lay to rest some of the concerns that were raised by members of the opposition.

Before that committee, I was impressed by the variety and scope and intensity of the submissions by many people who spoke there in a very articulate defence of recreation, sports and culture. I would point out, though, that every single one who opposed Bill 119 at that time thought, or were led to believe by the opposition, that somehow there was going to be a reduction in dollars to recreation, sport and culture. When it was explained to them, the rationale of the bill and the prioritization within the bill, the majority of people accepted that.

What happened was that most of them asked, and this is the one point that was made, for some commitment. I want to put this on the record because this is the record that will be seen,

not only related to Bill 119 but Bill 114, was that at time we asked the Treasurer to come before a committee to allay the fears of those people that somehow, in the terms of the member for Markham who kept saying it, "The pie is getting smaller and smaller." Indeed, the pie is not getting smaller and smaller. What is happening in culture and recreation is that whole field is expanding and indeed the demand for dollars is expanding and public expectations for those dollars are expanding. But so also are the moneys available.

The Treasurer appeared before the committee, and I would like to read into the record the words of the Treasurer on Thursday 5 October 1989. This is from the committee minutes, the afternoon sitting. He said:

"I would just like to say to you, Mr Chairman, and I know that the Hansard record is here for all to use in the future, that I can make a commitment as Treasurer that for the next three years—I have told you what the commitment has been for the past three years—that was in the nature of \$95 million. "It will be not less than the \$119 million this year. If you would prefer to think of that as \$120 million over the next three years, that is a commitment I am putting before the honourable members willingly. I really expect that it will be more than that."

Those are the words of the Treasurer, that is a commitment from the Treasurer and many people who appeared before the committee were quite willing to accept that as a commitment of more dollars to sports, culture and recreation.

1700

Just to wind up, I really wanted to ensure that the record showed that what is happening is that exactly the same arguments are being used on Bill 114 as were being used on Bill 119. I would like to point out, though, that what is happening, as we understand it, is that everyone who came to the defence of the use of lottery funding in the areas of sports, culture and recreation—and indeed I think members will find this in the area of the environment, because the reason this is being brought forward is that many people have asked and have put forward, in an affirmative way, support for lottery funding going to the environment. On that basis, I would just like to let those matters rest. I would like to allow the minister to wind up in the rotation.

Mr Charlton: It never fails to amaze me, the rubbish that flows out of some members of this Legislature during debates on legislation, but thankfully sometimes that meaningless comment that comes from some members just confirms my view of particular legislation that we are dealing with. That is certainly true in the case of this bill.

The member for High Park-Swansea got up at the end of the speech by the member for Cambridge and made some silly comments about the view in his party of democracy somehow being related to the right of poor people to choose to purchase lottery tickets. Obviously the member for High Park-Swansea understands very little about desperation, very little about compulsion and nearly nothing at all about democracy. For the poor, desperation is something that has no relationship to democracy at all. Put another way, the extension of what the member for High Park-Swansea was saying—that people who have an illness should have the right to choose to purchase lottery tickets—is like saying that heroin addicts should have the right to legally purchase heroin in democratic Ontario.

Mr Fleet: Are you comparing people who buy lottery tickets to heroin addicts?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for High Park-Swansea, please.

Mr Charlton: As I said, the member for High Park-Swansea obviously has no understanding of the illness, no understanding of desperation and compulsion.

Mr Fleet: You don't understand desperation.

Mr Charlton: His comments now just verify what I have been saying.

Let's talk about this lottery legislation and what the real context of democracy is in the kind of lottery system we have set up in the province of Ontario. We have a Liberal government in Ontario that claims to champion the free market system, that claims to be a strong supporter of small business, but let's look at the democratic way that the lottery operation in Ontario gets jammed into the so-called free market system.

When we started out with lotteries back in the early 1970s, lotteries were designed for the purpose of funding special events, exceptional circumstances, and then we extended the use of lottery funds to cover one-time investments in sports teams or arenas. But we never, until this Liberal government was elected, considered lottery funds appropriate for the day-to-day operation of government. Lottery funds were always designated for special events, exceptional circumstances and one-shot investments.

What have we done in the lottery system over the course of the 20 years since we created lotteries in Canada? In the free enterprise system, in the free market system, we have gone from a time when all the lottery tickets we sold were printed tickets and any retailer who wished to sell lottery tickets could choose to sell lottery tickets in a free and open way. It did not matter whether he was selling lottery tickets in combination with cigarettes, potato chips, T-shirts or records; every retailer had the right to sell lottery tickets in Ontario.

But then they find, through promotion and study, that they can make greater lottery ticket sales by mechanizing the process, by computerizing the process and by making some of the games more fun. They farm out the installation, maintenance and profits from the operation of that mechanized, computerized system to private sector entrepreneurs.

Now we have variety stores. Some are chains, some of them are small local variety stores, and they are competing with each other. But the one that can sell enough lottery tickets gets a machine and the one that cannot sell enough lottery tickets, even if he could sell enough to make himself some money and keep his customers coming in, cannot get a machine. We have the government of Ontario promoting a system in a supposed free market where the market is not free any more—not for everybody, anyway.

How does that fit into the government's notion of democracy? Is that a fair system to the retailers who have been into my office who have had their machines taken out or who cannot get a machine and who are losing customers to the guy down the street who has a machine? We have this government imposing itself in a supposed free market system in a way that favours the big against the small and it says: "We believe in democracy. Poor people should have the right to choose to buy lottery tickets." That is the government's view of democracy. My God, what has democracy in this province and this country come to? That certainly is not how I understand democracy and freedom.

I go back to a comment I made a few minutes ago about how lottery funds are used. The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere made comments about whether or not the studies and the

figures which were quoted by my colleague from Cambridge with regard to a very serious illness, pathological gambling, were correct. He is right, we do not have any good studies here in Ontario. We ran into the same problems in the energy field, because this government does not like to know reality in terms of Ontario. But the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere says in the same breath, "I won't support the amendment of the member for Cambridge to take some of the money out of the lottery to put it into the problem of"—

Mr Faubert: That's a specified amount.

Mr Charlton: Listen.

1710

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Charlton: Listen. The member for Cambridge would have absolutely no objection to taking the 0.5% of the lottery profits and for the first couple of years using that designated money to do a major study of the problem in the province of Ontario so that in fact we could design our clinics and our health centres to suit the problem in the province of Ontario. But the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere says: "We don't have a study in Ontario. I wouldn't mind seeing a study, but I'm going to vote against any possibility of seeing the study appropriately done."

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Charlton: That is a really, really wild way to approach the problem. The member for Cambridge suggested 0.5% to start dealing with the problem of compulsive gambling of people who cannot control their urge or whose urge becomes an escalating urge to gamble. He did not suggest that we should not look at how best to utilize the funds once they have been designated. I did not hear him say that.

This bill is going to the standing committee on general government, as I understand it, where all of those kinds of specific ways that we want to approach problems like compulsive gambling, pathological gamblers, can be set out. But the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere says, "We don't know that the problem is as bad here as it is elsewhere, so I won't support the member's amendment."

That speaks to a government that just does not want to know. If we do the study and the study finds that there are no problems in the province of Ontario and the study is conclusive and we have all agreed on what the terms of reference and the methodology of the study should be, I am sure the member for Cambridge would say: "Great. Give that money to the hospitals or to the environment then." But this government does not even want to look at the problem. It wants to pay lipservice to it by saying, "Yes, it may be a problem, and if it is, we have sympathy," but it does not want to take the time to specifically deal with it.

And that brings me to the last real set of problems that I have with this piece of legislation, which is that we have got—and again the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere in his comments said that the Treasurer made guarantees. Well of course the Treasurer made guarantees when the hearings were on on Bill 119. He made temporary guarantees that may or may not exist at the end of the period that he referred to, because there is nothing in the legislation that provides any protection for the people in the sports and recreation community and there is nothing in the legislation that provides any guarantees for

anyone involved in the other areas that we are expanding out into.

One of the things that happens when you start to try to depend on something like lottery profits for hospitals or for the protection of the environment is that you become dependent on an undependable, unpredictable source of revenue. Perhaps the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere should take a look at what happened to lottery profits during the recession, and yes, it is fair to say taxes went down during the recession as well, but the decline in taxes was nowhere nearly as significant as the decline in lottery profits.

Hon Mr Sorbara: Let's have the figures. Show us the figures. Give us the figures to prove it.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Charlton: It is all in Hansard in the report of the former committee of this Legislature, the standing committee on procedural affairs, when it reviewed the Ontario Lottery Corp. If the minister wishes to see those figures, he can take the time.

The members of this caucus would feel much more comfortable with whatever this government or any government in this province would want to designate lottery profits for based on the approach which I set out at the beginning of my comments. If this government is prepared to set up an environmental fund and to funnel certain amounts of lottery profits into that fund for environmental emergencies—but not for the day-to-day operation of the Ministry of the Environment and the programs under it—and if this government wants to set up a special fund that is available and designated for environmental purposes and nothing else, for perhaps the cleanup of landfill sites where we have no polluter to go back on because they are the mistakes of the past, we would be prepared to talk about things like that.

But the government will not designate anything. It will not spell out anything in this three-paragraph piece of legislation except to say to the people of Ontario that it wants to use lottery funds for the protection of the environment because it wants to sell more lottery tickets. It is not because they want to make a clear, factual, readable, understandable commitment to the environment that anybody can pick up and say, "Yes, this is the extent to which lottery funds are being committed to environmental protection or environmental cleanup in Ontario." That is not what they are doing. There is nothing here. There are two paragraphs that do not do anything to protect the environment.

The member for Markham may or may not be right. Whether the dollars are ever spent or not does not matter, since they may be spent tomorrow and not available to the environment the next day because the government may have another priority. There are no procedures. There are no guarantees that the tickets the government promotes out there to the public of Ontario as lottery tickets for the protection of the environment—there is nothing to guarantee that will ever happen. So the member for Markham may be right; it may never happen. But he may be wrong. It may happen for a year or a year and a half or two years or three years.

What happens when the government decides on another priority and they do not have a guarantee or they change their minds? Or what happens when we have a recession and the lottery sales drop off? Who then covers environmental protection in Ontario? What then does this government do? Does the Treasurer have the courage to stand up with his next budget and say, "I've got to raise income taxes or sales taxes by two or three or four points, because over the last decade we committed

ourselves to environmental protection with lottery funds that no longer exist"? Is that what this government does when the slump happens?

This caucus opposes this legislation. My colleague the member for Cambridge has suggested a number of amendments that would certainly make the legislation better than it now is, but it appears clear to me that the members of the government party are more interested in impressions that they can throw out publicly than in clearly defining the process, the environmental protection that will result from lottery funds or hospitals that will benefit from lottery funds. This bill does not provide me with the confidence, especially based on the kind of comments I have heard during this debate, to allow me to support Bill 114.

1720

Hon Mr Black: I am pleased to have the opportunity to, hopefully, clarify some of the misunderstandings that surround Bill 114. I would like to stress first of all that we are here debating Bill 114; we are not debating Bill 119, which is legislation that was passed and is now history in this province. Bill 114 provides for a new lottery fund, a lottery fund which was committed to in the 1989 throne speech, a lottery fund which will provide funds for a new purpose in Ontario: the protection of the environment.

I should point out that what in fact this bill does is add seven words to the legislation which has been in place in this province since 1975 and has had some revisions during the years; seven words which simply state "and for the protection of the environment."

Second, I want to make it very clear that the addition of the environment to the list of government programs which can now benefit from lottery profits will not in any way—and I want to say this clearly and emphatically—affect funding for culture, recreation, sports or fitness. The Treasurer of this province has made that commitment. He has made it publicly and it is recorded in Hansard. This government is committed, as it has been in the past, to continue to adequately fund those very important and vital programs in this province. What the passage of Bill 114 will do is allow the Ontario Lottery Corp to introduce an environmentally-themed lottery.

Over the past two days we have heard numerous people from all sides of this House speak to this legislation. With one or two exceptions, I have to say that we have heard more nonsense than anything else. We have had members of the opposition who have outdone themselves in terms of misleading, misinterpreting and misinforming members of the public in the province of Ontario.

Yesterday afternoon those of us who were in the House had the opportunity to hear the member for Nickel Belt deliver a lecture. I want to say to you, Mr Speaker, it was a lecture that I listened to carefully for two reasons. First of all, because I have a great deal of respect for the member for Nickel Belt, and second, because he served in this House for a long period of time and he has behind him the experience which makes his words well worth listening to.

Basically, what he said to us was that the people of Ontario are not fools; they will not be fooled by the rhetoric of members in this House who do not speak clear, understandable English and who do not present the facts. I wish the member for Nickel Belt were here today so that I could compliment him on a very fine speech, to tell him that I agree with him 100%, but to tell him also that he was talking to the wrong congregation. He should have been turning and speaking to the members of his

party and to the members of the third party who have failed to heed his words.

Instead, I want you to know, Mr Speaker, that what they did in many cases—not in all cases, and I will acknowledge those in just a minute—was to deal with myths. I think it is important that we set the record straight. I believe it is important that the people of Ontario understand very clearly the facts of the proposed legislation.

What are the myths the opposition would try to have the people of Ontario believe? The first one is that this revision of the Ontario Lottery Corporation Act somehow changes the rules of the game and directs proceeds to the consolidated revenue fund for the first time in the history of the province.

I happen to have with me a copy of the original legislation, and I want to take a moment, if I may, and read to you—because I know you are interested, Mr Speaker, and I know other members of the House are interested—that original wording. I refer now to section 9, which says: “The net profits of the corporation after provision for prizes and the payment of expenses of operations shall be paid into the consolidated revenue fund.”

Since 1975 this legislation, which was introduced not by my government but by another government with a different political hue to it, has always paid the proceeds into the consolidated revenue fund, yet members of the Progressive Conservative Party have tried to make the public believe we are doing something that is different. Mr Speaker, I tell you quite frankly, I find that appalling. The fact is that we are not in any way changing what has been going on in this province in terms of the dispersal of those proceeds for the past 15 years.

The second myth that the opposition have tried to create in relation to this legislation is that by adding an additional source of revenue for environmental purposes, that can somehow be interpreted as meaning that this government does not have a commitment to funding for the environment. What is most disconcerting about that is the fact that those charges come largely from members of the Progressive Conservative Party. Those of us who have lived in this province know just how little commitment previous governments of the Progressive Conservative faith have had for the environment in this province.

I want once again to provide the people of Ontario with some hard, cold facts. In the 1984-85 budget, which was the last budget the Progressive Conservative government of the day had the opportunity to visit upon the people of Ontario, the budget for environmental purposes in this province was \$312 million in total. The current budget of our government for the environment is \$649 million. Mr Speaker, I ask you, does that sound like this government has a commitment to the environment that is above and beyond anything that any previous government in this province has ever had? It convinces me more clearly than any words could. The facts speak for themselves.

We have heard the member for Simcoe East, the member for Mississauga South and the member for London North suggest that somehow our party and our government does not care about the environment. Let me tell you, Mr Speaker, the people of this province know better. They know better because this government has consistently dealt with environmental problems, has consistently been recognized as a leader in environmental projects and environmental initiatives and in protection of the environment in this country and, indeed, in the world. The record speaks for itself.

The third myth that the opposition would have us believe is that this government is spending less money on culture, recrea-

tion, fitness and sport than has previously been spent. They referred on many occasions to the Bill 119 hearings and the concerns that were expressed there. They have talked about our lack of commitment to small communities. Once again, I want to answer those kinds of charges not with rhetoric, not with words, but with facts.

What are the facts that we can use? Let me go back once again to when the original legislation which brought the Ontario Lottery Corp into being in Ontario was brought into place in this House. The statement of the minister of the day, the Honourable Robert Welch—a Progressive Conservative minister in a day when the Progressive Conservative Party had many more leaders than it has today, let me tell you—the words of Robert Welch on 30 January 1975 said this: “We expect that sales could reach \$100 million within the next couple of years.” I quote, Mr Speaker, and I know you want me to be accurate, so I will quote exactly from what is recorded in Hansard. “We expect between \$40 million and \$50 million to be available for physical fitness, sports, recreation and cultural programs.” That was the expectation when the lottery corporation was brought into being.

Today, some time later, we find that our government is now spending three times that amount. Our commitment to culture and to sports, recreation and fitness in this province has been without parallel. No government in the history of Ontario has spent more money or has made the kind of ongoing commitment to those programs that our government has made.

I want also to tell you, Mr Speaker, that I was disappointed, quite frankly, in some of the comments which came from some of the members in the debate yesterday. I want you to know that our commitment to small communities and communities in northern Ontario continues as it has in the past. I want to say to you, Mr Speaker, how soon they forget.

1730

On 14 February 1990, at about this time of the day, I stood in the town hall in Marathon and in the audience was the member for Lake Nipigon, and I regret that he is not able to be with us now so he could hear me say what I want to say to him. At that time we announced recreational capital grants for the Lake Nipigon riding—and the minister will be shocked to hear this and many members will be shocked to hear it—recreational capital grants that total, for this year alone, \$457,000.

How much did we spend in Rainy River, because the member for Rainy River yesterday expressed some concerns about the levels of funding? This year alone recreational capital grants to the riding of Rainy River were \$394,000.

Let's turn to the third party. Let's look at Nipissing, the riding of the new leader of the third party in this House. This government spent this year \$627,000 in recreational capital grants in Nipissing riding. In case my colleagues are not hearing me properly, let me repeat that. In Nipissing we spent \$627,000.

How about Simcoe East, because we heard from the member for Simcoe East, who unfortunately had to leave us and was not able to be with us today. But we did hear from the member for Simcoe East yesterday and he talked at great length, as he always does, about the lack of funding for recreation. I want to say, as usual, he was not using facts; he in fact did not check the record. He did not know what he was talking about and that is usually the way the member for Simcoe East debates in this House.

But the fact is that in the great riding of Simcoe East this government this year has committed \$708,000 for recreational

purposes, for the purposes of promoting amateur sport and recreation in the riding of Simcoe East.

Those are facts, those are not myths. Those are facts, hard, cold facts, which I think spell out in great detail the commitment of this government to adequately fund programs and to meet the needs of this province in small communities in northern Ontario and in ridings regardless of what kind of representatives they elect.

I want to make some specific comments about one or two of the speeches that we have heard in the last two days and I want to at this point make a reference to the speech we heard yesterday—and I specifically said “yesterday”—from the member for Cambridge. It was a speech which did capture our attention. We listened intently and we listened carefully, because it was well-considered, it was thoughtful and it provided all of us with the opportunity to consider very carefully some recommendations which are being made by the member for Cambridge and which, I am sure, most of us in this House will consider and consider carefully.

I have to say to the member for Cambridge, although I sympathize with his views, although I recognize the validity of the points he has made, there is one link that is missing. There is not at this point, to the best of my knowledge, research which clearly indicates the link between lotteries and compulsive gambling. There has been, as many members have pointed out, very limited research done, so we are not in a position where we can draw conclusive conclusions.

But I will say that the most extensive study was completed at Iowa State University, on behalf of the Iowa Department of Human Services, and that was released 25 August 1989. That study, the broadest in its field, reported that there was no significant link between lottery play and compulsive gambling. In fact, it went on to point out that the very reasons that make people compulsive gamblers are not necessarily present in lottery play.

I say to the member for Cambridge that I am supportive of the positions he has made and that I recognize the validity of the concerns he has expressed. I want him to know I am prepared to work within cabinet and to work within government to try and address that problem, and to work with him to address that problem.

I remain unconvinced that taking lottery funds, which could suggest a link between lotteries and compulsive gambling, is the most appropriate way to address that need. However, I do want him to know, and I say this most sincerely, that it is a concern I will be pleased to discuss with him and a concern that I would be pleased to join with him in trying to find solutions for.

I also want to comment on the remarks made by the member for Markham. We are always entertained by the member for Markham, who is an entertaining debater in this House. But what we saw here today was a new height in hypocrisy. Either that or it was the greatest conversion that has ever been witnessed in the history of this world, because we had the opportunity today to see a member of the Progressive Conservative Party, a member who has sat in this House for some period of time and was a member of previous governments under previous kinds of leadership, the people who authorized the Pauzé landfill site, suggesting that the government which closed the Pauzé landfill site is somehow at fault. I want to tell members that is indeed hypocrisy.

Let's look at the facts, and the facts are very simple and straightforward. The facts are that we propose to establish a new lottery, the proceeds of which will go to the protection of

the environment. This legislation gives us the authority to do that, as a government. If members of the opposition parties had done their research carefully, they would recognize that the new lottery was announced in a press release on 4 April 1990. “A new lottery to help support environment cleanup will be launched next month”—that was being perhaps too optimistic—“says the president of the Ontario Lottery Corp.”

What it also went on to say is that revenue from the new lottery is only for the environment and money from Ontario's new environmental lottery will be earmarked for environmental spending only. I think that spells out very clearly the fact that this government is being straightforward. It is being honest with the people of Ontario. The changes being proposed in this legislation are not all that significant. They simply add six words which make it possible for us to put additional funds into the fight to protect our environment.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Farnan: It is my understanding that this bill will move to the standing committee on general government for public hearings for two weeks.

Bill ordered for standing committee on general government.

REPORT, STANDING COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for adoption of the report of the standing committee on resources development on Bill 208, An Act to amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act and the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mrs Marland: I know the member for Nickel Belt had concluded the debate on the report of this bill, but I also understand that there is some agreement that the next speaker will be the minister from the government side of the House. I am quite happy to speak third on the reporting of this bill.

1740

The Deputy Speaker: We usually have the rotation.

Hon Mr Sorbara: There is agreement, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: There is an agreement? The member for Mississauga South would speak after the minister?

Mrs Marland: I am at the pleasure of the minister.

Hon Mr Phillips: I think the member for Mississauga South spoke last on it and so I had assumed it was in this rotation. I plan to speak for only about two minutes, because I am frankly anxious that we deal with the committee report so that we can get on to the detailed committee of the whole discussion in the near future.

Hon Mr Sorbara: You spoke on 26 March, Margaret.

Mrs Marland: No, I didn't speak last time.

Hon Mr Sorbara: Yes, you did.

Mr Mackenzie: Mr Speaker, it is my understanding, and I think Hansard shows, that we had an argument over whether or not the member for Mississauga South would have the right to

speaking, but she did follow, after some argument, my colleague the Chairman of the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: So what now? Would the member for Mississauga South like to speak after the minister?

Hon Mr Phillips: I did happen to check the Hansard. The member for Hamilton East is correct that the member spoke at some length, so if I might just now begin debate on the bill, as I say, I plan to be quite brief because it is my expectation that the House will deal with this quite thoroughly in committee of the whole.

I guess I would just make three points. One is that this is an extremely important bill. I think the members are aware that in this province each year we continue to see about 400,000 accidents. We see up to 300 deaths each year as a result of either accidents in the workplace or disease in the workplace. On the financial front, the Workers' Compensation Board has an annual compensation bill of about \$1.5 billion. Of course, the most important thing is the human tragedy of it all. So make no mistake: We are dealing with an extremely important matter here.

The second point I would make is that while there is of course opinion on the bill, I think as we look at this bill we will find it is the most progressive health and safety legislation anywhere in North America. We have proposed in this bill some substantial improvements. I might add that I found the committee process extremely helpful, and as a result of the hearings a number of amendments have taken place, amendments, I might say, that have been proposed by all three parties and members from all three parties on the committee.

The bill, in my opinion, now has been substantially strengthened. I am anxious to get on with the bill. I am anxious to have a thorough debate in the Legislature, clause by clause, on the bill and then, of course, most important, get on with implementing the bill so that we can improve health and safety in our workplaces in Ontario.

Mr Mackenzie: I wish to speak for just a few minutes on this bill. First, I want to reiterate just for a moment, because I think probably in the 14 or 15 years I have been in this House this is one of the most important issues we have dealt with—it certainly is to me and to most of my colleagues. I think that it is important to once again set on record what we are really dealing with, the extent of the problem in the province of Ontario. It is a problem that the labour movement has seen fit to classify as "slaughter in the workplace," and unfortunately that is literally what the case is in Ontario.

In Ontario we have, on average, one worker being killed every working day. We have about 450,000 workers who are injured and file compensation claims every year in Ontario. It is not a record to be proud of. There are a number of other things that should bother all of us. More than four million workers in Ontario have been injured since the present act, Bill 70, came into force, and I well recall, as do some other members of this House, the long, hard battle to establish the first really useful piece of health and safety legislation in Ontario. But since that time four million workers have been injured in Ontario. Enough workers were injured in Ontario to fill Maple Leaf Gardens every night for 30 consecutive nights. That was in one year alone, 1988. Since 1979 serious lost time claims have increased more than 30% and since 1979 the number of disability claims has increased more than 100%. Clearly there is something wrong with health and safety legislation in the province of Ontario.

I think it is useful to put a number of other things on record quickly: 78% of the workplaces in Ontario were violating one or more sections of the Occupational Health and Safety Act; 7% of employers with more than 20 workers had not established a joint committee, which is the mechanism for the internal responsibility system required by law and which this government—and the previous government, I might say—said was the road we had to go; 34% of employers with designated substances but fewer than 20 workers had not established the joint committee required by the regulations; 35% of the worker members on joint committees were selected by the employer, in violation of the act.

I could go on and on, but I think it is useful to put on the record that this is why we have the problem. This is why it is a fundamental and serious issue with workers in the province of Ontario that we have not dealt with, and it is what led to the development of Bill 208.

Unfortunately, the Bill 208 that came in, while not a bill that we would have drafted and not a bill that the labour movement would have drafted, was a substantial improvement. I am talking now, let me make it clear, about the original Bill 208. It was a substantial improvement over the Bill 70 that we had and I think people were prepared to gamble on it, I guess. But we no sooner had that bill before us in this House than we started to find a campaign that I found almost sickening. We had leaflets put out by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business—"Ontario's Union Health and Intimidation Act, A Horror Story in the Making," "Union Threat to Small Business," "Workers' Police to Stop Work," "Urgent, Please Act."

But even worse than that, we had a letter that I think this day is one of the most unfortunate letters that was ever sent in Ontario. I am talking about the letter that was sent by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, by the president, J. Laurent Thibault, to the Premier of this province. I think it is essential that this letter also is on the record as we get into the preparatory period for clause-by-clause work on this bill.

This letter, dated 2 March 1989, was sent to the Premier by courier. I will read only a couple of paragraphs out of it, but that is all members need. It is available and has been made public to anybody who wants to take a look at it.

"Dear Premier:

"CMA is very disappointed that your government decided to introduce Bill 208 without further consultation to try to resolve its major flaws that have been identified by CMA and other associations in the province. The majority problems are," and he goes on to list them.

Then the last paragraph, which as far as I am concerned is little short of blackmail, went on as follows:

"I will be calling you early next week to arrange a meeting. I hope that changes to Bill 208 can be made before the groundswell of opposition by our members and others in the business community grows out of control."

That letter was sent to the Premier. It was not very much later that all of a sudden we had some switches in cabinet positions, we had a new Minister of Labour and we had the bill brought in for us to start working on it. And what did we find? We found that the Minister of Labour wanted five changes. Those changes, in effect, substantially weakened the bill that had first come in, Bill 208. Needless to say, there was a fight over hearings. We had some difficulty, and I think the process we went through is one of the things that bothered me to some extent, but we finally managed to get the bill out for some five weeks of hearings around the province.

I want to tell members, those hearings were useful and one accurate point in the minister's statement is that they have resulted in some changes. As far as I am concerned, the bill is still not the bill that workers in Ontario need, but it certainly is not as bad as the initial expectation after we saw the new amendments, which incidentally almost paralleled some of the points that Mr Thibault had made in his letter. I think it shows clearly, whether government members like to accept it or not, the problem we have had, and that is, who is calling the shots and who is paying the piper? Whoever pays the piper calls the tune seems to be the case, because the amendments that came in without consultation from anybody in the labour movement were amendments that the business community wanted.

1750

I want to deal with only one or two points during the course of the hearings. We could not accommodate all of the people who wanted to appear before the committee on this bill, but there were a number of highlights, only one of which I really intend to speak to for a moment or two here today. That was during the course of the hearings in London.

Everywhere we went, incidentally, we had a tremendous turnout of people who were interested in this bill. It was obvious the strength of the feelings as far as workers were concerned. But at the opening of the hearings in London, there was a demonstration of some 300 people outside the hotel rooms where we held the hearings. When the hearings were ready to commence, these workers filed into the committee room and they deposited on the front table, where the witnesses were to make their presentations, a daisy, each and every one of them.

They deposited 288 daisies for the 288 workers who had been killed the previous year. They made the point—and I think it is worth making this point again and again to members in this House—that the 288 workers who had been killed on the job in Ontario were not the Laurent Thibaults, the management people, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business people, the foremen, the supervisors, the people who had been arguing that this bill gave labour too much power or was not needed to stop the slaughter in the workplace. The 288 people who had died were in every case ordinary rank-and-file workers. They were the ones who were paying the price. It was they, along with their unions, who were saying, "Hey, look, we need better legislation in Ontario."

Surely to goodness nobody will argue with the figures, which are WCB and government and ministry figures, in terms of the problem we have in safety and health in Ontario. Surely nobody will argue that it was not necessary. I think that point, more than anything else, should say to people—at least I would hope it would say to people; obviously I have got some different values from others—that if there was any validity to the arguments being made, the credence should be given to the arguments that were being made by the workers who were the ones who were dying, not the management people, and the same thing in terms of injuries in the workplace.

Unfortunately that is not the case, and the emphasis, as I say, and the amendments that we had to deal with and fight off in the course of the hearings, some of which we did, some of which we did not, were the arguments that had been bought by this government and by the Premier as a result of the kind of pressure that was put on by the business community in Ontario.

It seems to me that there is a clear lesson there, one that bothers me as much as what we have seen on auto insurance and on a number of other issues recently. That is, who is calling the shots for this government in Ontario? It is obvious that it

was not the workers in the course of the Bill 208 hearings, just as it was not the workers in the case of the Bill 162 hearings. It is obvious that they did not have the ear of the government to the extent that the business community in this province did.

I think the other thing that bothers me about the process we went through—and we never did finish, in committee, all of the clauses of Bill 208. We have still got to do some of those in this House. The time frames were so short that it was impossible to deal adequately with every section of the bill. We had some real arguments on the bill, as members of the committee will know, in trying to stop some of the new amendments the government wanted to bring in, change them, get some of the amendments that workers wanted or even bring it back to the original position of the original Bill 208.

The tragedy of it, as far as I am concerned, is that there is evidence. At first it seemed to be denied, but I am talking now about contracts that have been signed at Denison, Rio Algom and Inco, where the unions were strong enough that they were able to negotiate contracts that went beyond the minimum requirements in terms of health and safety and where they had the right to refuse and many of the rights that were in this original piece of legislation.

The evidence also before that committee, I submit to members, was that they had not misused the power and the rights and that in fact some of the biggest improvements had been in those locals, particularly in parts of the mining sector, the part of the province where we have some more effective coverage, that the record had improved rather dramatically. I think the evidence was fairly clear, yet we had a number of incidents that really bothered me.

I can recall one of the executive members of Inco—they did not finish or did not get everything in that they wanted when we had the hearings in Sudbury so they appeared before us in Dryden. The representative from Inco said: "Look, we already have these rights, but we have them because we developed a trust with our workers and we are not having a problem with them. But it should not be put in legislation and we should not give it to anybody else." I cannot understand that line of reasoning any way you want to put it to me.

But what he also did not say was that the reason it was in their contracts and it was working was because they had been forced to put it in as a result of contract negotiations. It was working and they had it, so it is fine for them. His only excuse was that, "We have developed a position of trust." They have developed it because they had to and it was working but we should not give this kind of a right to anybody else.

I think the figures that I started with clearly indicate that the workers of Ontario do need the right and the coverage to have this kind of protection under health and safety legislation in Ontario.

Let me make one other point. It is not my intention to keep this going, but some of these things, I think, have to be clearly on the record. In my honest opinion, shared not by everybody in the trade union movement but by a lot of people, if ever there was an opportunity for this government to begin to break down some of the barriers and start developing a position of a little less confrontation, which we are never going to lose totally in labour-management negotiations, but a little less confrontation and a little more co-operation and working together and support and breaking down some of the barriers, it was in the field of health and safety.

And it had to be done, if it was going to be done and be accepted, on the basis that what we were looking at were the people who were paying the prices. It is not just the 288

workers who died a year ago in Ontario. There are as many as 6,000 more according to studies that may have died directly as a result of industrial diseases.

The ordinary workers, not the management people, not the chamber, not the manufacturers' association or the Canadian Federation of Independent Business that were making the arguments against this legislation—they were not the people who were being injured or dying—it was the workers. We had to start deciding that in this province we were going to give workers legislation that gave them equality in terms of making the decisions and running the show and deciding what was safe.

It is not my experience, in the long time I have been in the trade union movement, that many of them are going to abuse that privilege. We had to start by saying, "Hey, we do trust you." Not just the phoney kind of an argument we got in Dryden from Inco but: "We really do trust you. We are willing to give you equality in terms of control of health and safety in the workplace."

Had we done that, had we not cut the corners we have cut in this piece of legislation, in my opinion, we would have taken the single biggest step we could have taken in the province in developing the beginning at least of a slightly better atmosphere between workers and management.

But management obviously did not see it, from the kind of letters and threats they were sending to the Premier. He did not understand it because he bowed to their wishes, and we certainly were not able to convince most of the members of the committee of the need for more than we got.

I am admitting that we did not end up with the bill as bad as we thought we were going to after we first heard the minister's amendments. But I think it is a tragedy that we did not stick with the original bill and that we did not decide, "Hey, we are

going to find out whether we really can make health and safety work on a joint responsibility, a joint trust basis." That is not the route we have gone with this legislation, and I am very sorry to say that.

I would like at this point in time just to say that I agree with the reporting of this bill and look forward to dealing with it clause by clause in the days to come. I thank you for the opportunity to speak on it, Mr Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

ROYAL ASSENT

The Deputy Speaker: Before we depart, I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in his office.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: The following are the titles of the bills to which His Honour has assented:

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the City of Toronto;

Bill Pr43, An Act respecting the City of Brampton;

Bill Pr63, An Act respecting the Victoria County Railway Company Limited;

Bill Pr64, An Act to revive Ontario Skeet Shooting Association;

Bill Pr67, An Act to revive the Harewood Park Association;

Bill Pr72, An Act to revive Silayan Filipino Community Centre;

Bill Pr76, An Act to revive Jabko Holdings Ltd.

The House adjourned at 1800.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaitre, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Christine E.	York East	L	
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn.	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines, Minister of Culture and Communications

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: David R. Cooke, Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrondola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Floyd Laughren, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, James F. McGuigan, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Ruth A. Grier, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**Regulations and private bills**

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-chair: Lily Oddie Munro

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Shelley Martel, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: David E. Neumann

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Joan M. Fawcett, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Herbert A. Epp, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray

Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Thursday 31 May 1990

Private members' public business

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 166 . . .	1437
Mrs Cunningham	1437
Mr Miller	1438
Mrs Grier	1439
Mr Cousens	1440
Mr Reycraft	1442
Agreed to	1451
Northern health travel grants	1444
Mr Miclash	1444
Mr Hampton	1445
Mr Eves	1445
Mr Kozyra	1447
Mr Pouliot	1448
Mr McLean	1448
Mr Campbell	1449
Miss Martel	1450
Mr Wildman	1450
Agreed to	1451

Members' statements

Trucking industry	1452
Mr Farnan	
Children's services	1452
Mr Runciman	
William J. Teggart	1452
Mr Mahoney	
Timothy Garland	1452
Mr Kormos	
Long-term care	1453
Mrs Cunningham	
Sudbury land reclamation	1453
Mr Campbell	
Soft-drink containers	1453
Mrs Grier	
Farm tax rebate	1453
Mr McCague	
Seatbelts	1453
Mr Owen	

Statement by the ministry

Seniors' Month	1454
Mr Morin	

Responses

Seniors' Month	1454
Mr Farnan	
Mrs Cunningham	
Mr J. M. Johnson	

Oral questions

Resignation of cabinet minister	1455
Mr B. Rae	
Mr Scott	
Tire dumps	1456
Mrs Grier	
Mr Offer	
Mr Mackenzie	
Resignation of cabinet minister	1457
Mr Runciman	
Mr Ward	
Premier's Council	1457
Mrs Cunningham	
Mr Kwinter	
Abortion	1458
R. F. Johnston	
Mr Scott	
Resignation of cabinet minister	1459
Mr Runciman	
Mr Ward	
Pay equity	1459
Mr Faubert	
Mr Phillips	
Highway construction	1459
Mr Morin-Strom	
Mr Fontaine	
Conservation authorities	1460
Mrs Marland	
Mrs McLeod	
Wine industry	1461
Mr Dietsch	
Mr Sorbara	
Use of herbicide	1461
Mr Hampton	
Mrs McLeod	
Standing committee on general government	1462
Mr Runciman	
Mr Ward	
Religious education	1462
Miss Roberts	
Mr Conway	
Workers' Compensation Board	1462
Miss Martel	
Mr Phillips	
Charitable gaming	1463
Mr McCague	
Mr Sorbara	

Petitions

School opening and closing exercises	1463
Mrs Cunningham	
Religious education	1463
Miss Roberts	

First readings

Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, 1990,	
Bill 174	1464
Mr Reycraft	
Agreed to	1464

Second readings

City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr4	1464
Mr Kanter	
Agreed to	1464
City of Brampton Act, 1990, Bill Pr43	1464
Mr Callahan	
Agreed to	1464
Victoria County Railway Company Limited Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr63	1464
Mr Cureatz	
Agreed to	1464
Ontario Skeet Shooting Association Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr64	1464
Mr Eves	
Agreed to	1464
Harewood Park Association Act, 1990, Bill Pr67	1464
Mr MacDonald	
Agreed to	1464
Silayan Filipino Community Centre Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr72	1464
Mr Velshi	
Agreed to	1464
Jabko Holdings Act, 1990, Bill Pr76	1464
Mr Owen	
Agreed to	1464

Third readings

City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr4	1464
Mr Kanter	
Agreed to	1464
City of Brampton Act, 1990, Bill Pr43	1464
Mr Callahan	
Agreed to	1464
Victoria County Railway Company Limited Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr63	1464
Mr Cureatz	
Agreed to	1464
Ontario Skeet Shooting Association Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr64	1464
Mr Eves	
Agreed to	1464

Harewood Park Association Act, 1990, Bill Pr67	1464
Mr MacDonald	
Agreed to	1464
Silayan Filipino Community Centre Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr72	1464
Mr Velshi	
Agreed to	1464
Jabko Holdings Act, 1990, Bill Pr76	1464
Mr Owen	
Agreed to	1464

Second reading

Ontario Lottery Corporation Amendment Act, 1990,	
Bill 114	1464
Mr Farnan	1464
Mr Fleet	1470
Mr Cousens	1470
Mr Faubert	1475
Mr Charlton	1476
Mr Black	1478
Agreed to	1480

Report by committee

Standing committee on resources development	1480
Mrs Marland	1480
Mr Phillips	1480
Mr Mackenzie	1481
Agreed to	1483

Royal assent

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor	1483
--	------

Other business

Visitors	1454
The Speaker	
Business of the House	1464
Mr Ward	
Adjournment	1483

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1484
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1487

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le jeudi 31 mai 1990

Déclaration ministérielle

Mois des personnes âgées	1454
M. Morin	



40 1990

40 1990

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 4 June 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 4 juin 1990

Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 4 June 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HEALTH PROFESSIONS

Mr Farnan: The Minister of Health has said that the proposed health legislation she has inherited will be brought before the Legislature this session unchanged. Under the proposed legislation, health care workers will remain unregulated; that is, pastoral counsellors, social workers and crisis centre volunteers would become vulnerable to prosecution for doing their jobs.

We can support the general intent of the proposed legislation for regulation of health care professionals, especially with respect to the standards of self-regulation. However, clauses 24.04 and 24.06 within the proposed health professions legislation are not in the best interests of a significant portion of our population and broader consideration should be given to include both traditional and non-traditional health disciplines in the health care field under the proposed legislation.

It has been reported that the minister will not budge in her determination to keep the wording as it is. She has indicated that the only wording acceptable to the powerful College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario is the present one.

The present wording is unlikely to be acceptable to the citizens of Ontario once they hear about it. At least half the population relies to some extent on the services of unregulated health care workers—hospital counsellors, social workers, psychotherapists, holistic healers and many others. Indeed, under this legislation anyone giving advice over the backyard fence concerning a cold or other human health condition would be breaking the law. This is intolerable.

TRANSPORTATION

Mr Cousens: Each year the first week of June is designated National Transportation Week. Activities are held nationwide to acknowledge the crucial role of Canada's transportation systems, both socially and economically.

Today in Ontario transportation has become a central issue for the public. For millions of people in the greater Toronto area, transportation has become a very high priority. Clogged roads, perpetual traffic jams and overcrowded public transit are causing frustration and anxiety among members of the commuting public.

As chairman of the Progressive Conservative task force on transportation, I have had the opportunity to hear the concerns and listen to the suggestions. More than ever, this government has the opportunity to address the problems evident in our transportation networks. More than ever, this government must move quickly and decisively to improve what many term the lifeline of our economy and of our society.

The minister's announcement of 5 April was a good start. Members of my party eagerly await the plans of the implementation committee. Dynamic solutions must be found that combine new capital construction with effective management and upgrades to the existing system. No longer can we just respond

to our current needs. It is essential that we plan for the next generation. Time is of the essence.

PASSENGER CRUISE SHIPS

Mr Keyes: Today I rise to recognize the adventurous exploits of a brave and daring entrepreneur from my riding, Bob Clark, who has revived a mode of transportation one can associate with the discovery of this continent. That mode of transportation is the passenger cruise ship.

I am sure we can all picture vividly the time-honoured images of a grandiose steamer cutting the waters of the St Lawrence River in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The cunning riverboat gambler, the coquettish southern belle, the paddle-wheel incessantly slapping the water are all too familiar to us as we conjure up scenes of a steamship plying the waterways for both business and pleasure.

Bob Clark is the proud owner of the Victorian Empress, a 192-foot steamship which sailed magnificently into Toronto harbour recently. Passengers travelling on it for the first time extolled the virtues of this vessel. They were impressed with the spacious and well-decorated staterooms, the excellent service and an atmosphere of quietude and relaxation that we associate with sea travel. It was my pleasure to tour the Victorian Empress in company with a number of members of this Legislature.

Mr Clark will be venturing from Lake Ontario towards the Ottawa River, the Saguenay River and the great St Lawrence. In the true entrepreneurial spirit illustrated in the past by many eager and ambitious industrialists, Mr Clark is endeavouring to rejuvenate an area of the tourist market. I applaud his bold initiative in breathing new life into passenger cruise ships.

1340

FUNDING FOR THE HEARING-IMPAIRED

Mr Allen: Carol Lumsden, who has a four-year-old daughter, Veronica, deaf and with spina bifida, is getting rather worn out having to confront arbitrary rules like the rule that you cannot get funding from two ministries at once. Her daughter, Veronica, has been at the Chedoke treatment centre for her deafness for the last year or so and has made great progress. Now she is about to move on from Chedoke to the Queensdale school program for the hearing-impaired, which is of about the same intensity and presumably the same overall cost, except that this will now be funded by the board of education.

Well, so far so good, but currently Veronica has need and her mother has need of her being in a day care, which acts as a kind of extension to the hearing-impaired program for her. Veronica's mother gets 87.5% funding support for her child in the day care because the child is handicapped.

Here comes the problem. Because the day care is funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services and the hearing-impaired program will now be funded through the Ministry of Education, Veronica's mother is stuck in the catch-22 position of having to lose her day care option in order for her child to go on with her care for her deafness.

She will next year have two children in day care, an immense expense. She has additional expenses with regard to Veronica, \$1,700 since last fall, and if she cannot get day care

for her children, she cannot work. What a problem to put a mother in because of this arbitrary rule.

CHIEF SCOUT AWARDS

Mr McLean: My statement is for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and it concerns a memo dated 24 May that he sent to members about the Chief Scout Awards for the Land O' Lakes region. This memo stated that recipients on the list would be receiving their Chief Scout Awards on 16 June and that the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay would be presenting provincial plaques. It is most unfortunate that the memo failed to indicate the time and place of the awards presentation, and it was like pulling teeth when my staff called the member's office in an attempt to get this information.

Why is the member so secretive about this event? What is he trying to hide? Why is he ashamed of people who have worked so hard to get their Chief Scout Awards? I think the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay should get his priorities in order.

In any event, I do not want the member's secretive attitude to detract from the joy that should surround this event. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my sincere congratulations to all of the recipients of the Chief Scout Award in the Land O' Lakes region, and especially to Steve Cox of the 9th Orillia Troop, Barry Rye of the 1st Udney Troop, Jeffrey Klug of the 1st Penetanguishene Troop and Christopher Dunn and Kelly Moreau of the 1st Port McNicoll Troop. Their efforts should not go and have not gone unnoticed.

SANDERSON CENTRE FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr Neumann: This past Thursday I had the delightful opportunity of attending an open house at the Sanderson Centre for the Performing Arts in the city of Brantford. This centre was formerly known to community residents as the Capitol Theatre and is currently being restored and refurbished by the city of Brantford with funding from the province of Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communications to the tune of \$1 million. The federal government has thrown in funding as has the city of Brantford as well as many citizens donating capital dollars towards this refurbishment.

This 1,200-seat theatre was built originally for live theatre in 1919 and saw many vaudeville acts and other live performances in its early years. It was then converted to a cinema and for many years the people of Brantford, the kids of Brantford, went to see shows there.

In recent times Famous Players, which was the owner, threatened on many occasions to divide the theatre into three mini-cinemas and the community was afraid that it would lose the largest gathering place for citizens for cultural events.

The city of Brantford purchased the theatre and it is being restored. The original artwork in the ceiling is being restored, the mural is being put back, and when it opens on 8 September at a gala performance with Anne Murray as the guest performer, it will recreate the original atmosphere of 1919.

ERAMOSA PLAY PROJECT

Mr J. M. Johnson: I would like to extend an invitation to the members and anyone who is listening to come and celebrate the Eramosa community play. It is the biggest event in the township since the retreat of the glacier.

The Spirit of Shivarree offers a unique taste of rural Ontario, past, present and future. Share an evening of provocative

drama, elaborate costuming, original music, giant puppets, lively dance and a spectacular barnraising. Performance boundaries blur as the 150 cast members enact the drama on four different stages and throughout the audience. There is no backstage.

Come early and enjoy the natural beauty for which Eramosa township is famous. Have a meal, walk along village streets and enjoy the country fair which leads into each evening's performance.

The celebration starts at 7:15. Meet at the the old town hall on Highway 7 for a stroll down the old Valley Road to the playsite, the Harris Woollen Mill ruins along the Eramosa River. Go to the front gate of the Rockwood Conservation Area and walk down Rattlesnake Hill.

This is an outdoor performance. If anyone is interested, they can contact my office or the Eramosa Play Project, 118 Main Street South, Rockwood, Ontario, phone 856-2480.

SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr Matrundola: As members know, this month, June, is Senior Citizens' Month, and I am proud to rise and salute all the senior citizens.

About 25% of senior citizens are volunteers in our society, and more volunteers are needed. Therefore, I wish to encourage every senior citizen who can to get involved in helping those less fortunate who for health or other reasons cannot participate in voluntarism. Can members imagine how wonderful it would be if we had 100% participation? What a great sense of fulfilment it would give to our senior citizens.

Senior citizens provide an invaluable service and they help our government save millions of dollars. Many seniors are recognized by awards from the government and/or the community, but some go unrecognized. These volunteers believe in the law of giving and the law of harvest, which is to say, give and you shall receive, not once, not twice, but 100-fold. These very responsible seniors believe that the service they render is the rent they pay for the space they occupy.

Therefore, I wish to call upon my colleagues to pay tribute to senior citizens in Ontario. I particularly salute the seniors of Willowdale, with a special mention to the senior citizen volunteers who drive friends to doctors and shopping and who help with Meals on Wheels and an array of other things. In recognition of this Legislature's pride in our seniors, please join me in wishing all Ontario seniors a very happy seniors' month.

The Speaker: That completes the allotted time for members' statements.

Hon Mr Ward: Mr Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent for statements regarding Italian National Day.

The Speaker: Do we have consent?

Agreed to.

ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

Mr Leone: It gives me great pleasure to represent the Liberal caucus today in honouring Italian National Day.

On 2 June 1946 Italy became a republic and this date is now a national holiday in the Italian calendar. It is also becoming customary to celebrate this festivity here in Canada. Yesterday I was present at the celebrations on St Clair Avenue at Corso Italia.

Italians in many parts of the world are now fourth and fifth generation and they are active components of the country where they live and reside. Their presence here in Canada dates back to the first days of the discovery of this land. In fact, on 23 June

1497, an Italian, Giovanni Caboto, left England and reached the Atlantic coast of Canada. The province of Newfoundland recognizes this day as Discovery Day.

Between the two world wars Italians have come in great numbers to Canada, and especially during the years of open immigration of the 1950s and 1960s the cities of Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, Windsor, Hamilton etc have seen Italians arrive in the hundreds of thousands.

Today Italians are a vital part of this country. Children of Italian descent are today proud Canadians and are present in every aspect of public life, in the sciences, education, business and also in political life. Here in this Legislature, members of Italian heritage number 11. Some of us were born in Italy and are now part of the same Italian immigrants who helped to build this great province of Ontario and this great Canada.

Celebrating this holiday is not only a gesture towards the Italian government, but also to the hundreds of thousands of Canadians of Italian heritage. It is also a reaffirmation of the multicultural character of our nation. On Canada Day in 1985, on the inauguration of the monument to multiculturalism in front of Union Station, our Premier in his speech said: "Multiculturalism is Canada. Canada is multiculturalism."

When we celebrate something in honour of our lands, the lands which gave us birth, we are reaffirming the essence of our Canadianism. We are proud of this great nation. We are proud to be Canadians, but at the same time we are proud of our origins and our cultural heritage.

Certain to interpret the sentiment of this House, I extend congratulations to the people of Italy and to the president of the republic, Francesco Cossiga, through our consul general present here today, Dr Gianluigi Lajolo, and to the thousands of Ontarians and Canadians who are of Italian descent, represented here by the president of the National Congress of Italian Canadians, Ontario region, Mario D'Ambrosio.

[Remarks in Italian]

1350

Mr Philip: It is my pleasure on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, who is in Ottawa today, and the New Democratic caucus here in the Legislature, to add our congratulations to Italy on the occasion of its celebration of its national day.

On 2 June 1946, a majority of voters said yes in the referendum to bring about a united, republican and democratic Italy. We congratulate Italy and the consul general and distinguished visitors in the gallery on this memorable occasion.

Although Italy only became a united nation about the same time that our country formed as a Confederation, the role of people of Italian descent extended far before that. Father Bresnani, for example, the ethnographer of the Hurons whose studies were first published in Italian, has now had his contribution to this country recognized. Indeed, there were representatives of the Italian community in the early colonial governments of both French and early English Canada.

Although a majority of Italian immigrants came after the 1940s, it is safe to say that people of Italian origin have contributed to our country for as long a period of time as Europeans explored and developed this country.

We salute Italy in its growth as a nation. We recognize the importance that immigrants from Italy have made to our country. We recognize the importance of the family to Italian immigrants and of the industriousness which they have shown in building this nation.

With the growth and sophistication of Italian industry and the Italian economy, the connection between our industries and

those of Italy can only benefit all of us as Canadians and can only open up new doors to our industry.

[Remarks in Italian]

Mr Cousens: I will begin by saying I am not going to try to upstage the member for Downsview, whose Italian and presentation really have the spirit of what I want to say.

It is a pleasure today to speak on behalf of the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party knowing that the consul general is present in the visitors' gallery and distinguished friends of the Italian community. We, too, would like to share in the celebration of Italian National Day.

It is 44 years since democracy took control in Italy and it is 44 years in which a nation has built itself strong in the values that are really part and parcel of what we are proud of here in Canada. Ontario has a particularly large population of Italian descent. Immigration has brought many great people to our country from Italy. Canada has given them a land of opportunity where they have settled and worked, had their families, contributed to the community and made this a better place because of their contribution. They formed clubs and associations to help adjust to the problems of life in a new country. They have brought with them that culture and love of life that have enhanced our own community. They are a people who have a passionate love of life. They enrich the lives not only of each other but of the whole community. They are strong in the arts, music and architecture. Their commitment to hard work is an example for all Canadians. I especially respect their family values, their faith in God and their support of the church. These are the very foundations on which a society is strong.

Toronto has become more cosmopolitan over the years and Ontario has benefited throughout through the participation of Italians in all parts of our communities. I know in my own community the chairman of the York Region Roman Catholic Separate School Board, Joe Vergilio, has Italian background; the former chair, Celeste Pelliccione—Italian background; a significant number of people on regional and local councils—Italian background; the citizen of the year for our community in Markham, Carmen Di Paola—Italian background.

May I just say that there are more people of Italian background in our community who are doing good things than many of the other communities, and so you are setting an example that all of us can look up to. On behalf of our party and on behalf of all the people of Ontario, we join you in celebrating this very special day. May you as Canadians continue to give us that which you are so proud of: a love of life, a love of people and a love of democracy.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

ONTARIO HOME OWNERSHIP SAVINGS PLAN

Hon Mr Mancini: Many Ontario residents, particularly young people, look forward to the day they can buy their first homes, but with rising prices and escalating interest rates saving for a down payment can be a difficult task.

The Ontario home ownership savings plan program is an excellent example of this government's commitment to assist Ontario's first-time home buyers to build up their savings to purchase that new home. Launched in September 1988, the program is aimed at home buyers with incomes of up to \$40,000 for singles and \$80,000 for married couples. The program offers graduated tax credits for qualifying contributions to the plan.

In his last budget, the Treasurer of Ontario announced enhancements to the program. These are included in Bill 105, which awaits second reading in this House. In addition, the Treasurer announced changes to the Land Transfer Tax Act that further enrich the OHOSP program. With these changes, a first-time home buyer who opens a plan and who qualifies for OHOSP tax credits may also be eligible for a refund of land transfer tax. The amount of the refund will depend on the amount paid for the home. That is, for homes costing up to \$150,000, planholders will be entitled to a full refund of land transfer taxes paid. For homes priced between \$150,000 to \$200,000 planholders will be entitled to a partial refund.

To date, over 83,000 prospective home buyers have opened plans. Already the purchases of 26,000 first homes have been financed partly by this program. Some people might think 26,000 homes are nothing, but that in itself is a very large community. In 1989 alone, the ministry distributed more than \$6 million in land transfer tax refunds. The maximum refund on a first-time home costing \$150,000 is \$1,225. The average refund to date is \$670. For the taxation year 1988, more than \$11 million was distributed in OHOSP tax credits. The maximum credit for an individual whose income does not exceed \$20,000 is \$500. the average tax credit processed for 1988 was \$345.

OHOSPs are available at most Ontario financial institutions, including the Province of Ontario Savings Office. Interest rates are set by the individual institutions. To qualify for tax credits, annual contributions must be made before 31 December.

1400

LIQUOR LICENSING

PERMIS DE VENTE D'ALCOOL

Hon Mr Sorbara: Later today I will be introducing for first reading amendments to the Liquor Licence Act. Members may recall that last June the government announced its intention to introduce a variety of changes to the statutory and regulatory framework relating to alcoholic beverages. The amendments I am introducing today give effect to some of those changes.

These amendments reflect the government's commitment to the responsible sale, service and consumption of alcoholic beverages in Ontario's licensed establishments. They will provide realistic and enforceable rules. The changes will also address specific needs for revisions within a framework of continuing social responsibility. These rules will apply equally to all manufacturers of liquor, both domestic and foreign.

The amendments include provisions for more control over the sale of liquor to minors and provisions to allow the appeal process and the public hearing process to be more streamlined and cost-efficient. The Liquor Licence Board of Ontario will have greater authority to refuse to issue a special occasion permit where there have been problems in the past with a particular location. The act will also authorize regulations to require mandatory server training and to define private places where consumption will be allowed; for example, private offices.

Nous croyons que ces modifications encouragent un usage sûr et responsable des boissons alcoolisées, tout en assurant une réglementation ontarienne réaliste et applicable.

I urge that all members support the amendments when I introduce them for first reading later today.

RESPONSES

ONTARIO HOME OWNERSHIP SAVINGS PLAN

Mr Laughren: I wish to respond briefly to the Minister of Revenue. I was scratching my head a bit wondering why he was making the statement today, since this was already announced in the budget, but I guess a recycled statement is always appropriate for the Minister of Revenue.

I wonder if I could join with the Minister of Revenue in issuing a clarion call to everybody in Ontario out there who is earning \$40,000 a year to get in line for this program. If you are earning \$40,000 a year, you are eligible for assistance under this program to go and buy a \$250,000 house in Toronto. That is a resale house, of course; new ones are more than \$300,000. I do not know what the Minister of Revenue thinks he is doing by dropping this little pebble in the water. He somehow seems to think this is going to help people get into the housing market.

This government had an opportunity with its Homes First program to renew that program, which was working, but, oh no, because it was working, apparently, it abandoned that as well. That Homes First program meant a lot more than this program means, I can tell members that right now.

I sometimes wonder if, between the federal government's interest rate policy and this government not renewing programs that work and then only bringing half measures in for new programs, Ontario is not going to become truly a place to stand—no place to sleep or sit down, but a place to stand only—because the programs this government is bringing in simply are not adequate to meet the housing crisis in this province. They should take a look around and see what is going on. There is much to be done, and this government is not doing it.

LIQUOR LICENSING

Mr Farnan: In response to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the minister is talking here in terms of providing more control over the sale of liquor to minors. Obviously it is something we support.

However, the minister must remember that his ministry has many branches, and one of the things the minister should be aware of is that the initiatives this ministry is taking in the area of privatization and agency stores is a direction that is in direct contradiction to providing protection for the sale of liquor to minors. He must be maintaining his workforce in the LCBO, because it is there that he has qualified, professional workers who are dedicated to the highest standards and who will indeed ensure that there is protection for minors.

It also strikes me as rather extraordinary sometimes, the manner in which this government will act publicly in one instance and very privately in another. For example, when the minister has something positive to say, something constructive to say, and obviously something that will be supported in principle by the opposition, he stands up in the House and makes that statement.

That is very fine, but there is also another side of this ministry that I would like to take this opportunity today to point out. This ministry, as do all the others, very often acts through regulation. Not too long ago in this ministry, for example, we saw the liquor licences for restaurateurs increased by 550% through regulation. We did not have the minister standing up in the House and saying, "Licences will increase by 550%." We had the Treasurer of Ontario standing up and saying: "There are no tax increases this year. In fact, it's just a packet of cigarettes.

That's where you get your tax increase this year. But there are no other taxes." However, when you go for your motor vehicle licence, when you go for your fishing and hunting licence and when restaurateurs go for their licences, you find extraordinary increases of up to 550%.

Let the public of Ontario beware: there should not be taxation without representation. It should be debated in the House. This minister has a double standard: something good, he stands in the House; something negative, we do not hear from him.

ONTARIO HOME OWNERSHIP SAVINGS PLAN

Mr Brandt: I want to applaud the Minister of Revenue for being able to deliver this statement with a straight face. He makes a point, Mr Speaker, of talking about the rebate, if you will, on the land transfer tax and how it is such a tremendous benefit to first-time home buyers if they are given the opportunity to participate in the government's program and get some of this money back.

Here is a government that talks about rebating land transfer tax as a stimulus to housing purchases when it is the selfsame government that in fact has increased the land transfer tax by literally hundreds and hundreds of per cent in previous budgets to discourage people from buying homes. The government cannot have it both ways. It cannot on the one hand say, "Well, we'll rebate part of the money, stimulate purchases and help first-time home buyers," and then on the other hand raise the land transfer tax by 300%, 400%, 500% and say to the people of Ontario, "We're not discouraging you from buying homes."

That is absolute nonsense. Not only has the government raised taxes with respect to the land transfer tax, it raised the sales taxes. Then it went along and raised taxes on a whole series of things, some of which impacted locally to make the purchase of a house in this province virtually beyond the reach of a first-time home buyer, particularly in the Metro Toronto market. This is absolute nonsense.

Another thing that the minister should be aware of is if he is proud of the figures that are contained in this document, he ought to go back and re-read exactly how this program is being taken advantage of at the local level by some people who are getting into the program the day before their house closes by borrowing the money, simply putting it into the program and qualifying for the money from the government. They are looking at this as some kind of windfall. It has absolutely no impact whatever on the decision to buy a home.

I am going to challenge the minister to take a look at how he arrives at this figure of 26,000 individuals who have purchased at least in part their home as a result of this particular benefit from the government. He must straighten up this program. It is not working. The first thing he could do is start to cut back on some of the horrendous tax increases which he has put in the budget and which are discouraging first-time home buyers.

LIQUOR LICENSING

Mr Sterling: I would like to respond briefly to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations regarding amendments to the Liquor Licence Act.

Hon Mr Sorbara: It doesn't have anything to do with tobacco.

Mr Sterling: He says it does not have anything to do with tobacco. If it is as successful as his act is on tobacco, it will not be very successful at all.

The control of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario on special-occasion permits is in total disarray in this province at this time. What this government has done is encourage people to drink by raising the special-occasion permits to \$100 each, regardless of how many drinks you serve. Therefore, small groups, non-profit groups and theatre groups which apply for a special-occasion permit from time to time and want to serve one or two drinks to their patrons are forced to promote the sale of more and more liquor in order to cover the cost of a special-occasion permit.

Instead of providing a special-occasion permit at a cost which is in relation to the amount of alcohol which is sold or consumed, this government has no idea what it is doing with regard to controlling the consumption of liquor in this province. It should be the government's goal to reduce consumption as best it can, while providing a reasonable access to liquor in most places. What this government has done is penalize small groups, non-profit groups, unsophisticated groups, by making the issuance of special occasion permits expensive and almost impossible to obtain.

1410

We believe that the whole system that we presently have set up should be abolished and that a reasonable system should be put in place. These groups can be trusted. They have been capable of delivering on that trust in the past. Our party believes in these groups. We believe that they have done a good service. They have controlled the sale of alcohol in the past and they will do so in the future. We only hope that this act will bring some small amount of relief to these many, many groups across Ontario.

The Speaker: That completes ministerial statements and responses. The member for Scarborough West informs me he has a point of personal explanation.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Mr Speaker, I would like to raise with the House my correspondence with you today in which I informed you that I will be resigning my seat as of 24 August, this summer, and I wonder if I could make a few comments to the House.

Agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FOR SCARBOROUGH WEST

DÉMISSION DU DÉPUTÉ DE SCARBOROUGH-OUEST

Mr R. F. Johnston: I would like to say a few words, if I could, about my decision to leave. As many members know, I have decided I will not contest the next election because of health reasons, but I have decided on this particular timing for a number of reasons, the first of which is I did not want to leave my future plans in the hands of the Premier and his decision about when decisions would be made. I thought I should start with the partisan kind of hit first.

Secondarily, there are many family considerations, not the least of which is that Vida and I are expecting another baby in July and I would like to be home for a while for this one. I consider myself a late bloomer in many ways, and also for matters of making some career choices, being able to leave at the end of summer is useful to me.

Mr Speaker, when I started off in this House, I was in seat 124, the farthest you could get from the Speaker, near the vacant seat of Speaker Stokes at that point, and now here I am

closest to you so that you can invoke that standing order for interjections on a regular basis. I am heard too well now at this end.

I have never, however, breached the sanctity of the seats on the other side, and that I regret, not just because I wanted the car but for other reasons as well.

This has been a place where, as many of us know, egos are alternately stroked and shattered on a regular basis, and I have enjoyed the great emotion that this place has provided. I remember, for instance, thinking about the pomp and ceremony of this place and my first speech in the House. I gave a great deal of thought to it. In fact, I decided it would be on the first equal pay for work of equal value legislative initiative that was started, and I waited for several weeks to make my speech in private member's hour on Ted Bounsall's motion at the time.

I did not know the rules well enough in those days, and the way the rotations worked, and so I was the third speaker. By the time it got around to me and I rose to my feet—and I had worked on this for three weeks—Speaker Stokes said, "I recognize the member for Scarborough West." There was a small round of applause from my colleagues, and then he said, "You have one minute." I said: "But Mr Speaker, I have been working on this for three weeks. This is my maiden speech." He said, "You have 45 seconds."

I then gave the most magnificent 45-second address this place has ever heard, and the vote carried. I should probably use the same example now, but I will not, because after 11 years and four elections I would like to take just a few more minutes, if I could, to say a few things about this place.

One of the things I have learned is that I am as much a partisan as ever in the issues that I have been fighting for over the years, whether they were to do with poverty or equal pay and other matters. They just keep coming up again and again and again; they never seem to go away. In the end, that is not something which is just a partisan fact; it is this place as well. The old saying about "the mills of the gods grinding slow" really does talk about this place as well. In fact, it is probably the only godlike thing about this institution and our work here. But I regret that many of the things I worked on have not come forward in terms of full fruition that one might want at the end of a career, but I like to think that I have pushed some of them along the way a piece.

I think in terms of my own influence on this place perhaps of moving us away from just the parochial and seeing our responsibilities as international as well as national from time to time has been, I hope, a useful kind of assistance.

I would like to say a few words, if I could, to the people of Scarborough West, who have been very patient with me over the years, not always understanding my tangents, whether it was around nuclear-weapons-free zones or going to Nicaragua or whatever. They have been very patient with me over the years and I hope they have liked the fact that I have often brought them into this place. When we have tried to raise issues, as we did in the past, about asbestos poisoning of individuals or other kinds of cases, they have come often from the people of Scarborough West. Their impact on change in this place has come because I have been able to be their funnel of information.

I wanted to say that the staff I have had over the years has been remarkable and still is to this day. I have had wonderful page staff and many wonderful interns. Some members would say too many interns when it has come to competition for interns in our own caucus. The reason I am making the announcement today is that Suzanne Schwenger, my last intern, is

due to have her baby on Thursday and I wanted to make sure she could be in the House today for me to make my farewell speech.

I would also like to say a few words en français. Premièrement, il faut remercier l'Assemblée législative pour le droit que nous avons d'avoir des classes de français depuis dix ans maintenant. Peut-être peut-on remarquer quelques changements dans ma méthode et mon vocabulaire.

J'ai été le premier député à suivre des cours au bureau. Auparavant, tout le monde devait aller en classe à l'Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario, mais maintenant beaucoup de personnes profitent des classes privées dans leur bureau. Ça, c'est très important, surtout aujourd'hui avec les problèmes qu'éprouve notre pays. Les changements dans notre Assemblée, quant à l'utilisation du français, ont été remarquables pendant les dernières dix années. J'aimerais encore dire merci pour le droit d'apprendre un peu le français ici.

I would also like to say a few words about the people who work here, not only because the Sergeant at Arms is personally responsible for my getting up here—I wanted to avoid this ritual, but he insisted that I do it—but there are many people whom no one knows outside this place. Whether it is the people who work in the cafeteria and the dining room who have been such great friends over the years, some of the cleaning people in this building whom I have helped to get permanent status in their employment over the years or the people in the parking lots or whatever, they have made this a very important experience for me, perhaps as much as for my colleagues. I do not know about the rest of the members, but they make this a very human and real place and not as detached as it maybe seems, from time to time, from the reality of the real world out there.

To my colleagues, I would like to say that it has been a wonderful pleasure working with you over the years. I have often been a minority within a minority and I have enjoyed that status. In fact, God knows what would ever happen if I voted on a majority side in all things. It would probably just shatter my whole sense of who I am. But it has been a great experience and I have had some wonderful support during some very trying times. I am thinking back to the heart attack and other times. It has been very good to have had members' help and support.

To all members on all sides, maybe I am known for my political partisanship and passion that I throw into a debate from time to time.

Mr Reycraft: Perhaps.

Mr R. F. Johnston: The member for Middlesex is saying, "Perhaps." He is not sure. But I also have dealt with members in nonpartisan ways, as chair of a committee during some very tough dealings around Catholic school funding and other matters, and I have really enjoyed the friendships which have developed over the years.

I might just conclude by saying that I look upon my own career now, and I have spent a lot of time thinking about it over the last number of months, with quite some satisfaction. I think in a very modest way I can feel that I have had some impact. Perhaps as a lesson for future backbenchers who will be part of the privileged 130 who are chosen—which is really a remarkable thing when you think about it—to be, at any given time, one of the 130, or 125, as it was when I started, individuals who come to represent the nine million in this province, you can have an impact. It may not be the changing the world that you think it will be as you enter, but there are small changes that you can see have been made because you have been here. I like to think that I have had a number of small moral and sometimes

deferred victories and no defeats. That is the way that I would like to look at my career.

1420

If I could say something to the Minister of Education and to the other members of the House, I worry about our parliamentary tradition. I worry about it because of some of the changes that have taken place in this House. I do not want to dwell on those changes to our rules that we have made in terms of the rights of the opposition and the yin-yang of the kinds of powers the executive council has to have compared with the opposition, but I despair about it more because of the apathy within our citizenry.

It seems to me that one of the new goals that we should be establishing for our Ministry of Education and for the future of education in our country and in this province is to produce active, democratic citizens who believe, as I believe and other members believe, or they would not have come to this place, that an individual can make a difference and that they can make the kinds of changes that are necessary by getting involved in a democratic process.

Too many people today do not think they have any impact at all and that their vote means nothing. If there is anything we can do within our educational system to change that, to reinforce the kinds of values that my parents gave me—I am sure that whoever speaks for the Liberal Party will mention that they were Liberal ethics that my parents passed on to me; I put a lot of them aside—but the participation that they insisted upon is one that I want to see more institutionalized so that the future of our democracy stays as strong and provides to others the kinds of wonderful opportunities I have had here.

Mr Laughren: Mr Speaker, if I would be allowed to say a few words about my friend and colleague, I would have thought that anyone who has expressed as eloquently as my colleague has the privileges of being a member in this place would at this point want to reconsider his decision. It seems to me that many of us will miss him a great deal.

I do recall, of course, the member's getting elected to this place back in 1979. He made an almost immediate impact on social policy in the province of Ontario, partly because of the leadership role he played in the formation of social policy, not just in this assembly and across the province, but in our party as well.

It was not very long before the member for Scarborough West was heeding calls to provide a different kind of leadership role, namely, that of our party. One of those persons who was making a call to him and encouraging him to do so was I. I certainly do not regret that. Although Richard did not win that leadership race, in a typical class act after the leadership contest was over, he threw himself with a great deal of vigour into the operations of this place and also into the formation of policy within our party.

I do not think any of us will forget the welfare diet on which he sustained himself and got himself into better shape than he is—no, I will not say that. Anyway, got himself into a different kind of shape.

As Richard moves on, the one thing that will stay in my mind will be his commitment to what I would call those who are neither young nor swift in body and mind. That commitment has been unshakable from the time he got elected.

I was glad to hear him say he thought that there were some victories, because I believe that there have been successes in the formation of social policy in this province. I do not think there is any doubt that Richard had something to do with that.

I do recall his chairmanship of the standing committee on social development as he travelled across the province bringing equal funding to the two public school systems in our province. I recall not only that he chaired that committee at very difficult times but that he always had time for people who were following the course of the committee. I can recall him sitting having a late-night glass of milk with people who were perhaps lobbying the committee or at least following with interest its deliberations. He really did do a fine job in that.

I recall as well that his demands for democracy on the committee were not restricted internally to the committees, and Richard mentioned his trip to Nicaragua and his fight for democracy there and then more lately Lithuania. I suspect that Vida, who, I am pleased, is here, had something to say about that trip as well. I think that we all have something to learn from the causes that Richard has championed since he became a member.

I think as well that—and I believe most members would agree with this—as an opposition member, you learn not to expect to get credit for the changes that you can effect or at least influence. I do not think that most of us expect that; I do not think that is why we are here. But I think that fairminded people in this province and in this House will acknowledge the fact that Richard has had an impact on social policy; I know he has within our party, and I believe he has across the province as well.

The population of Ontario may not knowingly miss Richard's presence here, but I think that they will in fact miss his presence here, although they will not perhaps be as aware of it as we are. I know that I will miss his presence here. I will miss his commitment to the causes. I will miss his humour—not all good—but I will very much miss his companionship as a member of our caucus. When Richard does leave, I do not know where he is going or what he is going to do, but I do know that whatever person or organization or institution he ends up with will be richer than they are today and that we in this place will be poorer. We are sorry to see you go, Richard.

Mr Jackson: As a member of the Progressive Conservative caucus, one would think that any time a member of the Legislature representing the New Democratic Party, having won four successful, almost uncontested campaigns against him, who speaks so eloquently in the House, that this would be some sort of cause for celebration. Unfortunately, I cannot say that, neither on behalf of my caucus nor for me personally.

I regret very much that Richard at this point in his life—he is a young man—has made the decision to leave the Assembly. I know the constituents of Scarborough West and many of us in this House will suffer in some way for his announcement today. But it is an opportunity for us to pay respects to a career and to an individual who, for those who have been willing to allow themselves to approach a fellow member of this chamber, to get to know him without being blocked, as it were, by their political persuasions but to try to attempt to get to know the person, to understand his belief system, which comes from his heart and not necessarily from his ideology. It has been a unique pleasure and privilege for many of us to say that we have not only known Richard Johnston but become his friend.

It was easy for me, as a brand-new member in 1985, to first meet Richard, to work with him on the standing committee on social development. Anybody who has worked with Richard knows that he has spent an inordinate amount of his legislative time on social policy issues, but they very much help define his outstanding career in politics, because that is where he gets his biggest sense of satisfaction and it very much defines his politi-

cal role. In fact, in his statement to the House today he very much regrets that he cannot continue that work but acknowledges that it has been in this very appropriate and important area for the advancement of society in our province as we know it.

For five years I have worked with him on committees. I am tired of his telling me he has never travelled anywhere on any committee of this Legislature, and it is true. In 11 years he has never benefited from what some consider the largess here at the Legislature for these wonderful trips. Perhaps now that he has left the Legislature, all manner of trips will be offered to him, but we regret that he is taking the rather short trip out from the Legislature back into public life, where I am sure he will continue with the same degree of dedication and service.

1430

We have seen Richard operate as a Chair of some of the most difficult bills and one of the most difficult committees of its day, the social development committee, during the minority government. He exhibited his outstanding characteristics. He was very gracious and he maintained control under very difficult circumstances with Bill 94, which he refers to as extra-billing. I still insist it was balanced billing, but we still do not agree on that issue, Richard.

He also referenced Bill 30 on separate school funding. These were not easy committees to chair. In fact, the one on separate school funding still holds the record as one of the longest and most intensive processes of public hearings ever experienced in the long history of this chamber.

To estimates he brought a unique characteristic. He was always serious and insightful and insisted that estimates were an appropriate function for us as legislators to pursue. They were not a formality to be dealt with and gotten through. He saw it very much as a forum where we could operate in a non-partisan fashion.

We could use estimates as a method by which we could explore, without the pressure of the media and this chamber, opportunities to improve and be helpful to a minister and his ministry and his staff. Richard, we attempted that on many occasions because of you, and I am hopeful that that legacy will continue.

I would like to suggest briefly that what I think has attracted many of us to Richard's style of politics is that he has clearly brought forward an approach which is different from most. He looks at every issue first, from his conscience, second, for his constituents, and third, on behalf of his caucus. I think I am fair in suggesting that his career has very much followed that sense of personal priority that makes him unique.

Certainly the Legislature would not survive if every member took that approach, but the fact that he brought that approach with such vigour in this chamber—and I am told that some of his most passionate moments were when he brought his belief system to his caucus and was not afraid to be at variance with his caucus and in fact with his leader. Then again, I am never told those stories directly. I only hear them in the halls in the sort of a fashion that we are not supposed to repeat publicly because we really do not have them confirmed.

We will miss Richard very much. I know there is some rumour that he is going to go into academic life. Somehow I cannot connect those two words with Richard Johnston, but I believe that he will be an outstanding professor or in whatever pursuit he intends to apply his politics and his passion for politics. He will teach many of his students the importance of

politics as an act of the heart as well as the head, and I am quite sure that they will benefit immensely.

On behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus, we would like to extend our best wishes to you personally, Richard, to your wife, Vida, who is here in the House today, to your son, Gabriel, your daughter, Daiva, and your yet-to-be-named new constituent. I wish you much luck personally. We sincerely will miss you very much.

The Speaker: The Minister of Education.

Hon Mr Sweeney: You had better leave, Richard.

Hon Mr Conway: I think my friends have set a very good and high example that I will do my best to follow.

I well remember the night—and it was before the by-election in April 1979; in fact, it would have been some time in mid- to late 1978—when, sitting about where the member for Oshawa now finds himself, I was chatting with Stephen Lewis, who had announced his plans to retire from the Legislature. He said to me, “We have a real live one for you, and whenever the by-election is called, I guarantee you will enjoy my successor.”

I remember campaigning in the by-election through the winter, and I think it was 5 April—it was the day that Colin Isaacs was also elected, because Stephen Lewis and Ian Deans left, I think, at roughly the same time. The live wire, it turned out, was in fact Richard F. Johnston, whom I had not met but whom I had known in a very real way because he was Buck Johnston's boy.

Buck Johnston, for those members who would not know Richard's father, was probably one of the best Liberals ever to participate in the public life of Renfrew county. Buck Johnston was an outstanding public figure who served on our council in Pembroke, who was very active in the Liberal Party, whose brother Walter was, for all the years until his death just a few weeks ago, one of my best friends and advisers, equally active in the Liberal cause.

So when I met Richard Johnston, I certainly was struck by how he had some of his father's skills. Buck Johnston was one of the best athletes, one of the best baseball players who ever played ball in our part of east-central Ontario. Those members who know Richard know that until his health difficulties of a few years ago, he was, among other things, a superior squash player. Certainly he had his father's athletic prowess, but his father's politics he seems to have set aside.

It was a very few days after his election in the spring of 1979 that I met him in full fury in the social development committee hearings around the Lakeshore Hospital matter. I am not going to go into that, but I shall remember my first encounter with Richard F. Johnston as one of the most memorable and unhappy of all the memories I have had over 15 years. I certainly was not the winner in that exchange.

Then of course it was just a few years after his entry, as the member for Nickel Belt observed, that we saw his participation in the leadership campaign of 1982. No one has yet mentioned one of our friend's really important mentors in this business. I hope I am not speaking out of turn here, but the late Jim Renwick, the long-time and very distinguished member for Riverdale, was someone who I know influenced all of us but I think he was a very close friend of the member for Scarborough West.

One of the keenest memories I will always have about Richard Johnston is the association he had, in that leadership particularly, with the late Jim Renwick, and particularly the famous week when they set off in the winter of 1981-82 in search of New Democratic Party delegates in Huron-Bruce. I remember it well because they encountered many more

snowdrifts than New Democratic delegates. As my friend the member for Bruce would say, they were snow-stayed somewhere between Hensall and Exeter and spent a long time, I think, in some farmhouse that happily was made available to them.

My friend the member for Bruce even said they were seen visiting certain provincial outlets in the area to try to get them through what was a very difficult winter week. Jim Renwick used to tell the story with much more relish than I can offer, but it was a good example of the kind of colour that our friend brought to that race and to his time in this Legislature.

What I also remember about that race was the vigour and the ideological intensity that our friend brought to that leadership. He was quick to point out that he was not going to be part of any kind of preordained establishment plot to make certain inevitabilities come about. He certainly did give full vent to that commitment. The speech he made to that convention is one we will all remember. It was not quite the winning way, but it left a very strong and distinct impression. It was shortly thereafter that we had the welfare diet to which my friend the member for Nickel Belt has made reference.

Certainly I would join with the member for Burlington South, the member for Nickel Belt and my colleague the member for Middlesex in remembering one of the member's most lasting accomplishments, which was presiding over the extremely difficult, delicate, endless hearings on Bill 30. As I was saying to the House just a few weeks ago when we were observing the elevation of our friend the member for Nipissing to the leadership of the Conservative Party, the role of committee Chair is not one of the most valued around this place, but it is very important. I do not ever remember two people doing a better job than Richard Johnston in that extraordinarily difficult enterprise. I was saying that the member for Nipissing handled the anti-inflation bills in his committee a little earlier with very considerable aplomb as well.

1440

I do not want to go on unduly, but I would have to observe on this day, 4 June, the anniversary of another time. It was five years ago today that His Honour was reading the speech from the throne by the late Miller administration, which makes me think about things where the member for Scarborough West had an impact. Certainly he was a very, very important part of the chemistry that occasioned the change of government five years ago. Whether or not he would look back on that personally as one of his great achievements I do not know, but I will always remember the important role he played in creating the climate for change that we all remember and associate with the spring of 1985.

It has been said that he played a very active role in a whole range of social policy issues, but I think he is also to be remembered for his contribution on national questions and certainly his participation as a member of the Legislature on the constitutional and language questions. The role he has played in his own party at the national level I think is a great tribute to the kind of opportunity that is afforded all of us and that not all of us, myself included, access to the same extent that he has over his 11 years.

In his internationalism, Nicaragua and Lithuania come to mind as two examples of where he has taken a very keen interest. I have not always agreed with some of his assessments, but I have very much enjoyed the perspective he has brought to this Legislature on those important public policy issues.

Someone once wrote that the New Democratic Party had become a protest movement becalmed. Today we celebrate a member of that party who is not at all becalmed. The kind of passion, sometimes anger and always lively participation that have characterized his 11 years I know will continue to fuel his participation in the public life of this province and country in whatever role he might select for himself.

It is sad in a way to observe a retirement at age 44. One can never predict the future. We wish him, along with his family, all the very best in whatever that future provides. I for one expect that the future will provide him with a very great range of opportunity that will continue to utilize his very considerable talents. To that future, we wish him Godspeed and good luck.

The Speaker: I know that all members keep a copy of the Legislative Assembly Act at their bedsides for bedtime reading and they will be very much aware that the member for Scarborough West has now given the House notice, as stated under clause 19(1)(a) of the Legislative Assembly Act. This will be recorded in the Journals of the House. According to other subsections of section 19, I will take further steps later in August.

ORAL QUESTIONS

PENSION REFORM

Mr Morin-Strom: I have a question for the Minister of Financial Institutions which goes back to pension indexing legislation, but I think we should first reflect on the five-year record of Liberal delays on pension indexing.

In December 1986 the Friedland Task Force on Inflation Protection for Employment Pension Plans was set up to make recommendations on indexing. In June 1987 the Pension Benefits Act was passed with a provision that amendments for indexing would be forthcoming. In February 1988 the Friedland task force presented its report. In March 1989 the minister responded with his document Building on Reform: Choices for Tomorrow's Pensions and called for a 60-day period of consultation. Now, more than a year after that period of consultation has ended, where is the legislation?

Hon Mr Elston: The honourable gentleman has asked me that question before. As I responded before, we have been held up to a certain amount of time in the Legislative Assembly. We have now just got by that. I thank the honourable member for Sault Ste Marie for asking me to come back into the forum with another piece of legislation, but I am not in a position to come forward at this time.

We are looking in a detailed fashion at the legislation as it is and at the replies which came from the consultative process. We are a lean and very mean sort of operation at the Ministry of Financial Institutions. We will now take the allotment of people who serve in our policy and planning group and change assignments so they can get on with dealing with the pension materials. We will be back in due course with recommendations surrounding the consultation input we receive.

Mr Morin-Strom: It has been five years since this Liberal government made a commitment in the accord agreement to provide pension indexing to pensioners in Ontario. While this government has stalled and delayed, retired workers have seen their pensions eaten away by inflation. A typical pensioner who would have had a pension of \$17,000 a year in 1985 sees his pension today worth only \$13,700, a loss of \$3,300.

What does the minister responsible for pensions have to say to these pensioners who have to struggle year after year with less and less money?

Hon Mr Elston: The honourable gentleman knows that part of the consultation document dealt with issues around the structure of pensions and how they were brought together to understand exactly what is required for retirement income opportunities. He knows as well that the pension consultation document looked at the impediments to setting in motion or putting in place new pension plans in the province.

All the material that will come forward to us or has come forward and is actually being refined by some continuing input from some sectors of the province will tell us some of the difficulties that retired people can anticipate with respect to how the pensions are structured currently.

We know there is one thing for sure, that in Ontario if there is a product to be purchased, we will have to pay the price for it. We cannot manufacture something out of nothing. There is a cost associated with putting in place the support funding for pensions. We have already gone through some pensions that have come up with some deficiencies and we talked about the need for solvent pension funding over the course of several weeks last year, as we dealt with two particular public sector pensions.

So the answer to the honourable gentleman's question is that we are looking at how pensions have to be funded to deliver the product that people had thought they had. That will mean that both the people who represent the employers and the beneficiaries will have to be—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mr Pouliot: Save him from himself, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Order, the member for Lake Nipigon. I really do not need any help, thank you. I appreciate that 60 seconds has 60 seconds in it. If a member is responding and one is listening, it seems long; if a member is on his feet for that 60 seconds, it seems quite short.

Mr Pouliot: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: My apologies. You are quite right, with high respect. I should exercise more patience, like the people of the riding of Lake Nipigon have to do on their pensions.

The Speaker: I do not think that is a point of order, but I do appreciate the acceptance.

Mr Morin-Strom: This government has let pensioners go now for five years without any protection from the deterioration of their incomes. At the same time, they have allowed corporations to take some \$300 million in surpluses out of those pension plans. This government has again shown that its friends are in the corporate area, not the ordinary workers and retirees of the province.

Will the minister take the side of pensioners and workers on this legislation and bring in a bill that will assist those workers to ensure that their incomes will be maintained in their retirement years? When will he do that?

Hon Mr Elston: The honourable gentleman has made some allegations which, as usual, are not completely accurate. There have been negotiated settlements in the labour marketplace which have featured the indexing of pensions. Those are arrangements that have taken place between employees as represented by their associations or trade unions and employers.

There have been steps taken that I think reflect the fact that the 1987 legislation brought in several indications of reform for pensions, including the indexing, as the member rightly indicated, but in addition to that some very basic standards which

also increased the protections afforded to pensioners in Ontario. We talked about the improvements in portability, which was a major difficulty that was overcome for the ordinary workers in Ontario. We have talked about the issue of growing in and a whole series of other initiatives which have provided the protections that the member has talked about seeking. In fact, they have been delivered and we continue to work for better pensions in the province.

1450

SUPPORT AND CUSTODY ORDERS ENFORCEMENT

Mr R. F. Johnston: In the absence of the Attorney General, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues regarding the support and custody orders enforcement in the province of Ontario for women who have court orders to have payments provided to them by ex-spouses. Why is it that the backlog is increasing at an enormous rate? By the support and custody enforcement office's own figures, \$230 million is in arrears on the files that the government has at present. That is up over \$60 million since last summer. The number of cases on file has jumped to 65,000 from 57,000 and people are complaining that they cannot get the kind of enforcement that the legislation and these officers were supposed to provide when this was brought in in July 1987.

Hon Mrs Wilson: The support and custody orders enforcement plan is a plan that is of very real importance to women and children in Ontario. We recognize that the numbers of orders which have been filed with SCOPE are increasing at a dramatic rate and that the numbers of people who have been working in SCOPE to enforce those orders need to be increased. We have looked at the telephone system that takes requests and questions from people who are phoning SCOPE to look at where their file lies in the status of SCOPE. We have made changes so that more calls can be answered and so that more people who are coming to SCOPE can feel that their case is being looked after in a more real and more timely way.

Mr R. F. Johnston: The minister is quite right: There are 90,000 children who are affected by this besides the women involved. But I wonder how the minister can say that this is more effective, the kind of dehumanized approach that is being taken here. The minister should confide to this House that in point of fact you now call a 1-800 number and you do not talk to a human being any more. All you get is recordings; that is all these people get. Almost all of them are phoning up in crisis because they are going on welfare, just as their predecessors had to before we brought in SCOPE, and all they get is a recording and they cannot get any assistance. How is it that the government is doing this? How is it that the government is providing only recorded messages to these women who are desperate for income for themselves and the 90,000 children involved?

Hon Mrs Wilson: The member, if he knows about the new phone program, will know full well that any person who phones SCOPE in this province can ask a simple question and get a simple answer by a computer but that any person who calls that line can also have the opportunity to speak with a person who can actually answer that question. The member will know, as will all members of this House, that through our constituency offices we have had to address some real concerns with the SCOPE program. I can assure the member opposite that those

concerns have been looked at very carefully and have been discussed by members of this government. I expect that real changes will be made very shortly.

Mr R. F. Johnston: Frankly, members on this side have been raising questions about this for months asking for some kind of action, and the minister's assertion that something is going to take place is not good enough. In point of fact, if you hang on to that line for 30 minutes or 40 minutes maybe you will talk to a human, but it takes that long to get through. I have a case here of a woman from the riding of Riverdale, who is owed money back to December 1988, who actually went down with a hand-delivered communication and is still being given nothing and has been told by the workers in SCOE that they could not guarantee when they would even acknowledge what she had handed them in person. Surely it is time for the government to make an announcement in this House about the changes in staffing that are going to take place so that people can get the service they need. Why will the minister not give us a time and numbers today about the worker replacements that we need to make sure this is not just another Workers' Compensation Board where we know nobody gets any service these days?

Hon Mrs Wilson: Earlier this afternoon in the House there were many comments made about the work of the critic for women's issues on the opposite bench, and he himself indicated that there were issues of great importance to him and that he only regretted leaving this House sooner than some of those issues could be addressed and solved. He himself gave the date of 24 August for his departure from the House. I am quite confident that before that date comes around the member opposite will feel satisfied that the concerns he as well as many members of this House have brought forward regarding SCOE can be answered effectively.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT

Mr Eves: My question is to the Minister of Health. I am sure the minister is aware that in the last fiscal year 1,805 people, I believe, have had to leave the province of Ontario for treatment outside Canada for alcohol and drug abuse. The reason for this, very simply put I think it is fair to say, is because the treatment is not available in the province. In Ontario, these patients must wait four weeks for medical assessment and, in many cases, up to a year for treatment. Why is the government not more committed to providing the necessary health services for these patients?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I have answered this question in the House before and I am pleased to answer the member once again. People, for a number and variety of reasons, seek treatment outside the province. What I find quite amazing is that this member would stand in his place and ask this question once again when he knows that treatment programs in this province have increased so dramatically since this government took office. I am very proud of the progress we have made. Granted, there is more that must be done, but this year we established an anti-drug secretariat, we developed a comprehensive policy, and in the area of prevention, education and treatment I would say that Ontario is leading the way.

Mr Eves: What the minister says is all very well and good, but again she is not answering the specific question that is being asked. If her services are so great, why do people have to wait for a year to receive treatment in Ontario, why is her ministry paying up to \$800 a day for individuals to go to the United States of America and why is she spending almost \$20 million a

year of the taxpayers' money to send 2,000 people outside Canada? Why does she permit this to happen if her services are so great here in Ontario?

Hon Mrs Caplan: As the member knows, whether we are talking about substance abuse, drug and alcohol addiction or any other illness, the OHIP policies are the same and treat alcohol and drug addiction as they do every other illness. I can tell him that patients, for a variety of reasons, choose to have their services provided outside of the province.

I would also tell him that in fact we must at all times review our policies to ensure that they are responsive to the needs of Ontarians. While we have made progress in the area of providing drug and alcohol programs—and that is significant; this year the increase is very substantial—there is more to be done, and we are constantly reviewing our policies and programs to see that they are meeting the needs.

Mr Eves: Would it not make more sense to spend the \$20 million a year that the minister is spending of the Ontario taxpayers' money to send these patients outside of Canada, who she says do not need to leave Ontario because she has the services here, would it not make more sense to take those same dollars and spend them here to improve the facilities and services for treatment that she has in Ontario? Yes or no?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I would remind the member opposite that in the last three years the ministry spending on drug and alcohol addiction programs has increased by 126%. The number of programs has increased from 93 to 150. I would say to him that we are always reviewing OHIP's out-of-country treatment policies and that I will take his advice into consideration as we review our programs.

1500

CHRONIC CARE

Mr Eves: I have another question for the Minister of Health; I am just warming up here. The minister is aware that there is a long waiting list for chronic care patients in the province of Ontario. There are over 3,000 patients alone in Metropolitan Toronto waiting for a chronic care bed. The waiting list for a chronic care bed at the Baycrest Centre for Geriatric Care is three and a half years. There are huge waiting lists in all our chronic care facilities. We are concerned that the government is not concerned enough to do something about this big backlog of chronic care waiting lists in this province. What is the minister doing to address the needs of these chronic care patients?

Hon Mrs Caplan: In fact, I am very proud of the record of this government in bringing forward substantive reform and change to the long-term care system. My colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services recently tabled, on behalf of myself and the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs and the Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons, a long-term care reform document called *Strategies for Change*, which I believe will, for the very first time, allow us to develop a comprehensive long-term care system which will focus on people, the services that they need and the most appropriate way of responding to those services, whether they need heavy care in an institution or home support services so that we can achieve our objective and their goal, which is to remain as independent and in the community for as long as possible.

Mr Eves: I do not think anybody would disagree that we need the long-term strategy with respect to chronic care. The minister herself has said on several occasions that as many as 25% of the beds in hospitals that are designated for acute care are taken up by chronic care patients. We raised the example in this Legislature just last week of the over 1,200 people on the waiting list for Queen Elizabeth Hospital here in Ontario. Almost every one of those patients is currently occupying an acute care bed elsewhere in the system. If the minister is so committed to improving chronic care treatment for patients and chronic care facilities in the province, why has she not done something about the drastic shortage of chronic care beds, why are there 1,200 people on the Queen Elizabeth waiting list and why do people at Baycrest have to wait for three and a half years to get a bed?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I was hopeful, when the member first started asking his question, that he was starting to understand that in fact people can receive services on an inpatient basis, an outpatient basis and at home. Unfortunately, he still does not understand the way the overall system seems to be working and what the issues are. In fact, he is quite correct: Some 25% of people seem to be inappropriately placed. People are in institutions who do not need to be there. People are in acute care beds when they could be provided services in alternative locations, in nursing homes and homes for the aged. That is what long-term care reform is all about. We have one of the highest institutional rates in the world here in Ontario. We force people into institutions because there are not the alternatives and the choices available to them as they seek a response.

We are working with the chronic care hospitals in reviewing their role as part of long-term care reform. In the meantime, I want to assure him that we are reviewing the budgets of chronic care hospitals to make sure that during this transitional time we will be able to ensure that the heavier-care services, those requiring inpatient treatment, will be available to the people of this province during this important time of transition.

Mr Eves: The same minister who is standing in her place now saying, "We don't need institutional care; we are doing something different," will be aware that on 14 May 1986 the Minister of Health of the day announced, as an election strategy, that the government would provide over 4,000 new beds to the system. Today, we are 2,000 beds behind. The minister is about 6,000 beds behind what her predecessor committed to the people of Ontario. There would not be 3,000 people waiting for a chronic care bed in the province if she had delivered the 2,848 that her predecessor promised on 14 May 1986. Was he wrong, or is the minister wrong? They are both sitting right there.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Did the minister hear the question?

Hon Mrs Caplan: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Several important reports have been commissioned by this government over the course of the last few years: the Evans report, Spasoff, Podborski. I can tell him that it was the policies of the previous government that resulted in the highest rate of institutional care in Ontario. What we are attempting to do is expand community-based services, provide inpatient services when they are required, provide outpatient, ambulatory and alternative services in the community, as well as supporting home care and home support services to allow people to remain as independent in their homes for as long as possible. One of these days the mem-

ber opposite will start to understand that people do not want to be forced into institutions.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Now, let's be orderly.

EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Mr Allen: I have in my hand a printout of all the 329 plant closures, reduced operations and layoffs that are reportable in the province of Ontario over the last three years. I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Labour to the 21 that took place in Hamilton in those three years and to the fact that only nine of those had employment adjustment committees while 12 did not, and the record is getting worse. In the first of those years, 1987, five out of seven plants had employment adjustment committees whereas in the most recent two years only two of eight and two of six had them. When they did have employment adjustment committees, employers contributed anywhere from zero to \$600,000 for their workforces, or from \$50 to over \$2,000 per worker.

Would the minister please like to explain why adequate and fair adjustment is not happening in Hamilton or across the province for workers in these situations?

Hon Mr Phillips: I very much appreciate the concern of the member and the concern for any worker who is laid off. The most important thing, and I keep stressing this, is that we continue to create jobs in this province, and I would just remind ourselves that fortunately in the past five years the unemployment rate has gone from around 8.5% down to 5%. I think the most important thing we can do is to continue to create jobs.

Having said that, the fact that the unemployment rate is relatively good in this province does not comfort the individuals who are in a situation where they have lost their jobs. I would say that wherever we can have both the employees and the employers participating in an employment adjustment program we find they work very well. We do not impose those programs. It has to be one that both sides feel they would benefit from, and wherever we have a request from both sides to participate, we will.

As we look down the road, I think this is an opportunity for us to improve in the area of employee adjustments. We will be looking at ways that we can make these programs more effective. So I repeat, what we look for is both sides wanting it, and where they do, we will step in and provide the assistance.

Mr Allen: The minister knows how those unemployment rates are concocted and how deceptive they are and the fact that organizations like the Economic Council of Canada say that 50% of the jobs created are bad jobs; in other words, they do not compare with the jobs that are lost. He also must surely recognize that the figures I have given relate only to those that are reportable—50 employees and over. There are endless numbers of plants and workers affected by an inadequate trigger mechanism. They get no treatment at all. There is no mandatory provision, as the minister himself has said.

Why is there not mandatory provision? Is one set of workers better or worse than another? For example, there is no model or standard of employment adjustment in any of the legislation that requires some measure of employment adjustment. One can go through a dozen different elements that this minister could be doing something about to improve employment adjustment, and it is not happening. Could the minister tell us why it is not?

Hon Mr Phillips: In terms of concocted statistics, I think we rely on the same statistics that we have over a long period of time, and those statistics show a substantial improvement in employment. As I said, we recognize that for those workers who are laid off that is no comfort to them, and I appreciate that.

We have been in the position of attempting to not impose on the bargaining parties a solution by the government. We have tended to want to work towards the two workplace parties working out an agreement and looking to the government to provide assistance where they request. There has been an attempt by ourselves, as I say, to not impose solutions. Normally I would expect that the members opposite might appreciate that not every workplace wants us to be involved. Many workplace parties have found that they, working together, have the solutions, and I think some of our union organizations have found mechanisms that they find very effective without the government's involvement, ones that they have developed over a period of time. So we have been reluctant to impose a government solution on the two workplace parties where they themselves have found better mechanisms.

Having said all that, I think there are opportunities for improvement that we are—

The Speaker: Thank you.

1510

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr Cousens: I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. Last week, as the minister will know, there was a press conference held on Thursday by the Canadian Commuter Rail group, a group of commuters very unhappy with what has happened in their relationship with the province of Ontario in trying to obtain commuter services to Peterborough and some of the outlying areas. The minister will know that these people have invested a great deal of time and money, and there has been private sector money as well, in the proposal for commuter rail services to communities outside of Metropolitan Toronto.

Will the minister please explain to this House why he led this group to believe that GO Transit had no interest in expanding into these communities, and then in the Treasurer's budget it was announced that GO rail service would be expanded into Barrie, Bowmanville and Guelph and that extensions to Brantford and Peterborough would be reviewed? There is quite an inconsistency with what was assured them in their earlier meetings. Now with the Treasurer's statement about future plans, it really leaves them in quite a quandary as to what the ministry's position really is.

Hon Mr Wrye: I appreciate the work that has been done by that organization and I appreciate the expenses it incurred as it went ahead with the study. I feel quite badly that they went ahead with some of that work and that we made a determination at the time to go forward with some additional enhancements of GO service. I do not feel badly about the enhancements, but I feel badly that we went ahead with them even while the study was under way.

If the honourable member wants to know who is to blame, I think he need look no farther than his counterparts in Ottawa. In the first place, none of us should be having to do what we are doing, because the federal government has responsibility for the system, a responsibility it has simply walked away from.

They did even worse than that. They walked away from it with 90 days' notice, no planning, no proper plans in place, no

time for anyone to properly assess this matter. So I do feel badly that we were forced to make an instant judgement. I told them at the time that we did not expect we would be moving forward and then decided it was an appropriate decision to take. I certainly do not apologize for the fact that we are moving forward with a system that is already one of the finest in North America.

The Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr Cousens: We on this side have as much influence in Ottawa as the Liberals did with Mr Trudeau when he was there. There is a different government. It may have the same name but it does its thing. The fact is that whenever there is a hard issue that comes along, all they can do as Liberals in Ontario is to blame the federal government.

What we are dealing with is a matter of trust between the government and the commuters in the province of Ontario. The question I had to ask the minister did not have to do with the federal government. I was asking the minister what it is he can do to help the Canadian Commuter Rail service and that really means—

The Speaker: Supplementary.

Interjections.

Mr Cousens: We are getting to them. The fact is they are starting to need a fish feeding or something.

The Speaker: This is question period and I asked the member for a supplementary. Would you place it please.

Mr Cousens: Would the minister answer the question. Would the minister advise this House what work is now under way to operate these lines? Is he prepared to meet and work with the representatives of the Canadian Commuter Rail to devise additional routes to those communities which they are prepared to service?

Hon Mr Wrye: I think it is really amazing to watch my good friend the member for Markham and how he is trying to separate himself from that group in Ottawa. He says, "The names are the same, but in every other way we are not like those guys in Ottawa." It really is an amazing situation, though given how things have gone in Ottawa recently, it is quite understandable.

I am quite prepared to meet with that organization. My staff has met with it on any number of occasions. We have tried to keep in contact with it as these discussions have gone forward because certainly that is a group with very many good ideas and good thoughts as to how we can move forward together to solve the challenges of rail transportation, and indeed general transportation in this province.

As we go forward studying the options of extending GO service into Brantford and Peterborough and the communities in those various commuter sheds, I will certainly want to meet with that organization and with others that in the past have shown the kind of vision that I think is so important in terms of expansion of public transportation in Ontario.

ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORP

Mr M. C. Ray: My question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and it concerns the operations of the Ontario Development Corp in the Windsor area. The minister will know that a concern has been expressed to me by business officials and local government officials about the adequacy of the lending practices of the Ontario Development Corp in the southwest region, particularly in the city of

Windsor, which as he knows is currently suffering from plant closures and heavy job losses and is in great need of capital investment.

Could the minister explain the variations in the lending practices of the Ontario Development Corp in those regions serviced by the ODC?

Hon Mr Kwinter: The ODC, as I am sure all members know, is an agency of my ministry that provides loans and loan guarantees to small and medium-sized companies. Its policies are more liberal than most conventional lending institutions, and as a result it usually can provide a very worthwhile service to industry. Having said that, they have an obligation to the taxpayers to make sure that there is adequate security and that they can in fact do business in a businesslike way.

I want to assure all members of this House that there is not one practice that applies to one area and not to another. They have an obligation to make sure that given the fact that their standards of lending are, as I say, more liberal than others, they protect that investment. They have to be accountable, but there is no discrimination against any region or any area in Ontario.

Mr M. C. Ray: The minister will know that it is now about two years since I first urged that ODC officers be placed in the Windsor office. Several months ago, he made a commitment to that effect, but so far as I am aware no action has been taken with respect to the minister's commitment. Could he please update us and advise when we can expect implementation of the relocation of ODC officers to the Windsor office?

Hon Mr Kwinter: The ODC is looking at its whole program to see how it can get officers out into all regions of Ontario. That is under way and Windsor is certainly in that consideration.

I think the member would want to know that since June 1985 there has been about \$4 million in loans and loan guarantees given to companies in the Windsor area, amounting to about 200 companies, with a direct result of about 3,400 new jobs being created. As a matter of fact, the Windsor area at the present time, although it is being serviced out of London, Ontario, has a substantial share of the funding that is allocated in that particular area of Ontario.

HEALTH CARDS

Mr Reville: My question is for the Minister of Health. I wonder if the Ministry of Health has not done one reorganization too many. The health insurance division seems to have come under the management of Dr Doolittle, or perhaps the minister has another explanation of why a new Ontario health card has been issued to a cat and a dog.

Hon Mrs Caplan: I have also read the story that was in the newspaper this weekend and we have not confirmed in fact that this took place. However, the ministry is investigating to see if fraud has occurred. If cards were issued and they are returned, I will assume it was just a practical joke. I would agree with Dr Finkelstein, as quoted in the newspaper, that abuse is unacceptable and that the government must be vigilant and take appropriate action.

1520

Mr Reville: If the minister is looking for a hint, if she looks for names like Fido, Fluffy and Marmaduke, that would give her a clue. A ministry official said that sorting cardholders into human and non-human groups could not be done at this time because summer holidays were coming. If that explanation

worries anybody, try this one: The government still does not know how or when it will find out how many cards were issued to people and how many cards were issued to members who are not people. I am wondering if the minister will reassure us that this is not the much ballyhooed better system we have been hearing about.

Hon Mrs Caplan: In all seriousness, I want to thank the member for the question because this re-registration, which is the largest in North America, was specifically designed to provide speedy assignment of new health numbers to all Ontario residents without causing concern about continued coverage. In developing the process and the system for initial registration of Ontario residents for the new health numbers, specific control measures were assessed to determine which could be best applied prior to the cards being issued and which were more appropriate to post-registration audit.

It would be virtually impossible to detect cases of intentional fraud without some kind of process such as the passport-like application process, and even there we know that where there is intentional fraud, that is very difficult to control. In a lighter vein, in order for a family pet to receive benefits other than publicity, it would be necessary to convince a health care provider that the pet was indeed eligible for OHIP.

Mr Sterling: Along these interesting lines that have been developed, one of our concerns about the issuance of health cards was the whole area of privacy and privacy protection. How can the minister assure us, if cards are being issued in such a random and easily accessed manner, that these cards will not be improperly used for purposes of identification and for purposes of using the system in the wrong manner?

Hon Mrs Caplan: As I said to the member opposite a moment ago in answer to his question, the re-registration of the province of Ontario, with some 9.5 million people—some four million applications are being received—is quite an undertaking and a very important one. He should know that only Ontario residents with a valid OHIP number and a surname are eligible to be registered through this process and everyone is required to sign his application or to have it signed on his behalf.

As I said to him, we are investigating to see if fraud has occurred and would agree that it is very important the government remain vigilant and take appropriate action.

I would say one thing further. There are a number of prior measures as well as post-registration measures that are being put in place to ensure that appropriate audit is taking place. All of this is being done with a view to protecting individual confidentiality and also to ensure that people have the information about how to most appropriately use their card to access health services in Ontario.

Mr Sterling: Part of our concern was the fact that there are 24.5 million OHIP numbers now in existence. We have 9.5 million people in Ontario. Even if we add all the cats and dogs that may be in existence in Ontario, we still do not get to 24.5 million.

Can the minister assure us that there will not be other methods of increasing the number of health cards so that there will in fact be more health cards in the future than there are now, this sum of 24.5 million different numbers that we have? Can the minister assure us that this new system which has been implemented at great expense to the taxpayer will not suffer from the same abuses as her present system?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I will tell the member opposite that the province of Ontario has embarked on a re-registration program,

a redevelopment of the OHIP computer and a new health number, which in fact has already taken place in every other province in Canada. We are learning from their experience and we are bringing in the appropriate measures to ensure that fraud is minimized, that people have the numbers they need and that the new system will be in place. I want to tell him that no system is ever without the opportunity for flaws. We are always looking at how that can be improved and learning from experiences in other jurisdictions as we move forward.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr Tatham: This question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. There have been newspaper reports lately about this matter of exports and about the effect the high Canadian dollar is having on the ability of Canadian exporters to compete in foreign markets. Could the minister comment upon the impact of the high Canadian dollar on Ontario exports and the programs his ministry has in place to financially assist Ontario exporters?

Hon Mr Kwinter: I want to thank the member for Oxford for the question. There is no question that the high value of the dollar is impacting negatively on our exporters. They are really in a situation of double jeopardy. When the free trade agreement was negotiated, the dollar was at 72 cents. Today the dollar is trading at about 85 cents to 86 cents. What has happened is that any of the benefits that could have been realized under the free trade agreement have really been wiped out.

Added to that is another problem. The problem is that we are not playing on a level playing field. We have the cost of capital, which is reflected in interest rates, with a 5% spread. We are up 5% higher than our American counterparts who have a built-in non-tariff barrier for our Canadian exporters. So all of those things combined have really put Canadian exporters at a disadvantage.

We have made representations to the federal government at every opportunity. We are going to continue to do it to see if they will change their policy. But until that happens we have, of course, no jurisdiction over that particular area. We do have programs that are in place by my ministry. We have a trade expansion fund that will provide up to \$35,000 for an Ontario exporter to help him penetrate the United States market. We have loans for capital equipment that will help him get more competitive. We have an export support loan program which provides up to \$1 million of revolving credit for those companies that are exporting into foreign markets.

The Speaker: Thank you. The member may have a supplementary; I do not know. I am sure there may be some further information he would want.

Mr Tatham: I appreciate the factors that are impacting upon our exports, but what initiatives are we taking? What things are we doing? What things could we do to help our exporters? What other things can we do?

The Speaker: Now you may continue.

Hon Mr Kwinter: As well as the programs I have already outlined, we have a couple of others that I think are very important. One of them is called new exporters to border states. What we do is we take potential exporters to border locations such as Buffalo or Detroit to take them through the steps of how they can in fact become an exporter. That has proved very successful and we have now expanded it to include a similar program, Euronex, to allow exporters who want to to penetrate the European market. We feel that both these programs will help

stimulate activity in the export community and take new exporters and show them the opportunities that await them in these rapidly expanding markets.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT

Mr Pouliot: My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. On 17 April she said in this House that she recognized the very specific need for a timber management plan assessment at the same time as the very important and the very real environmental assessment commission was sitting. In fact, her ministry issued a pamphlet, Timber Management Planning—Getting Involved Can Make a Difference. Some people got involved. In fact, eight specific cases came to the minister's door, reached her office, asking that they be heard.

Can she explain to the House, with respect, why in the past two years there has not been one single environmental assessment heard?

1530

Hon Mrs McLeod: I think the honourable member is well aware—in fact he has referenced it in his question—that there is a very intensive environmental assessment on timber management planning taking place right now. It is the most intensive environmental assessment on timber management practices that I think has ever been undertaken across the country, not only in the province of Ontario.

Obviously, we do have to continue to ensure that there is a supply of wood for the many mills that are operating both in northern and, to some extent, in southern Ontario while the environmental assessment of our timber management practices continues. Our commitment on each of the timber management plans that does receive approval during this period of time when the class environmental assessment is going on is that we will ensure that there is very thorough consultation in our planning process, as well as ensuring that through the ministry we are engaging in the most careful integrated forest management that we can bring to bear on each of those timber management plans. Obviously, each of them is examined individually before it is finally approved.

Mr Pouliot: Let's make sure, with respect, that we are talking about the same due process here. If the minister makes reference to the Red Squirrel Road, this was "a road assessment." What we have here is Timmins forest, Lanark forest, Magpie forest, Ranger Lake forest, Nakina forest and the list goes on and on. They are begging the minister. They want assessment work conducted under her ministry's auspices.

Only the minister and her ministry, with the stroke of a pen, can acquiesce with their legitimate demands. Can she? We can do it together. This is not sending someone to the moon. This is acquiescing the need, acquiescing the mandate that she herself initiated. Will she give us a commitment and please, soon, in the not-too-distant future, at her convenience bless us with a reasonable timetable? Will she do that?

The Speaker: Will you bless the member?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I confess that I am somewhat confused by the honourable member's question. I understood in the first question that he was asking about the possibility of individual environmental assessments on timber management plans during the course of the class environmental assessment being carried out. I would recognize, of course, that if that is the question it is the responsibility of the Minister of the Environment to determine whether or not an individual environmental assessment

would need to be carried out on a specific timber management plan.

My responsibility as Minister of Natural Resources is to ensure that every timber management plan that is brought forward by the ministry has been subject to the most careful analysis that we can bring to it to ensure that environmental concerns are being addressed and that there is a thorough consultation process in the development of each of those plans, and that we are responsive to the consultation that is taking place.

Those are my responsibilities. I undertake to ensure that they are carried out on each of the timber management plans. But there are, I would point out, hundreds of timber management plans across the province and it is essential that those continue in order to ensure that our forest products industries can continue to operate.

EDUCATION FINANCING

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Minister of Education. The minister would be familiar with this document, the third report of the select committee on education, which was not only sent to his office on 17 January but he also had copies of it several weeks in advance. He will know that this document specifically calls upon the minister to consult with the partners in education to determine a clear way of changing and calculating the cost of providing educational services in Ontario.

The standing orders clearly state that the minister is required to respond to this report within 120 days, yet 138 days have passed since it has been in the minister's hands. Could the minister please advise the House when he is going to give a formal response to this document?

Hon Mr Conway: At an early opportunity.

Mr Jackson: Mr Speaker, this should be a matter of some concern to you, given that this is in fact what the standing orders state and that this document has been in the minister's hands well in advance of that time. The minister will be aware that all members of this House have been receiving a large number of phone calls from senior citizens regarding the most recent receipt of the second instalment of their property taxes, recognizing that education is not only the largest component but it is the fastest-growing component. Many of them are expressing concerns for the fact that the government's share of operating funding has dropped to its lowest level in modern history in this province and Ontario taxpayers are now paying about 60% of those costs.

Given the fact that this is now seniors' month, given that seniors on fixed incomes are expressing the greatest amount of concern about the increases in their property taxes due to educational funding and financing in this province, does the minister not think it appropriate and timely that he immediately respond to the recommendations of this report and specifically look at the costs of education in this province and the reforms necessary to assist seniors?

Hon Mr Conway: I am sure my friend the member for Burlington South told all the seniors with whom he discussed this matter that it is this government which has raised the seniors' property tax grant from, I believe, \$500 to \$600. I just want to be sure that the member for Burlington South is pointing out that in consideration of the impact of property taxes on seniors, this Treasurer in this government has in recent years substantially increased the property tax grant, which has as its intent relieving from senior citizens the burden of the educational property tax.

We as a government are taking very seriously the advice which the select committee has provided, particularly in the very vital issues of equity and accountability. I can assure my honourable friend and anyone else with an interest in this subject that we, as a Liberal government, are going to proceed with reforms that have as their hallmark equity and fairness for seniors and for all other Ontarians.

EMERGENCY SHELTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr D. R. Cooke: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Because the poor cannot lobby on their own, I make it a point of trying to monitor the services available to them. I have been alarmed recently by the fact that the number of people seeking emergency food assistance in Kitchener has been increasing in unprecedented numbers over the past several months. As the minister might imagine, this news has come to me with some surprise because it is different from the reports coming from other cities such as Toronto and Ottawa.

I am working with community leaders to determine why this anomaly has arisen. However, this is all taking place just as social service agencies are struggling to make ends meet due to the discontinuance of the emergency shelter assistance program by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. St John's Kitchen is a case in point. The ministry's decision has had the effect of placing St John's Kitchen in a precarious financial situation.

Can the minister can tell the House why he has chosen to eliminate this important funding source, thus endangering the work of worthy groups such as St John's Kitchen?

Hon Mr Beer: I know that my honourable friend has been working closely with this particular group and I share his concern about some of the figures he has raised. The honourable member would know that when we brought in the major reforms last year and this year with respect to the social assistance system, it was in the order of some \$415 million. The intent was to ensure there was more money in individual recipients' pockets so that they would be able to have more money available for food and shelter.

At that time it was decided the emergency program which the member makes reference to, a program of about \$1,600,000, would be phased out because of the increased dollars that were going into social assistance reform in a major way. I should point out to the honourable member that this year we are still spending somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$700,000 to \$800,000 to work with organizations like St John's around a number of the non-food programs they have. As he also points out, in the main those have worked out well.

I am concerned about the information the honourable member has brought to me and can assure him that I have asked officials on my staff to look directly into this particular program.

Mr D. R. Cooke: I appreciate the thoughtful approach the minister has taken to this. In light of the continuing demand in Kitchener, would the minister be willing to set up some kind of transitional funding to allow St John's to overcome the heavy increase in demand that seems to be occurring at the present time while declines are occurring elsewhere in the province?

1540

Hon Mr Beer: I would want to make very clear to the honourable member that we would work closely with the St

John's organization in terms of reviewing what the specific problems were and in what way our ministry can help in terms of a number of programs we have. I recognize the important role that agency plays within the Kitchener-Waterloo area in dealing with the wide range of people who come there for a variety of services. In working closely together with the agency, we will do our utmost to find ways of assisting it in meeting the needs of the people who come to see it.

WATER QUALITY

Mrs Grier: My question is for the Minister of Health. For five years now this party has been trying to pressure this government into bringing in a safe drinking water act. The last time we raised it with the Minister of Health, she tried to pass the responsibility off to the Minister of the Environment or to the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare, but the Health Protection and Promotion Act clearly says that the promotion and protection of the health of the people of Ontario is the responsibility of the Minister of Health for the province of Ontario.

Can the minister explain why nothing has been done by her government to put in place standards for drinking water right across this province?

Hon Mrs Caplan: Quite rightly, in her preamble, the member has identified the federal government as having the lead in the development of standards and the Ministry of the Environment in Ontario as ensuring safe drinking water. She knows that our Minister of the Environment has done an outstanding job of advocating for the kind of appropriate response from the federal government. I support him in his initiatives and join with him.

Mrs Grier: The last time we asked the question the minister said she would raise it at the first opportunity with the federal minister of health, so I hope in fact that has been done. I want to say to the minister that we now have a list of 15 communities across southern Ontario that are receiving from the ministry or from their local municipality bottled water because the ground water or the surface water is so contaminated in their communities that people cannot drink that water.

Is she satisfied with putting this pressure on the federal government or urging the Minister of the Environment, who has done nothing about safe drinking water? When we first raised the question, he said the municipal-industrial strategy for abatement was going to solve it; MISA is now two years overdue. Why does she not, as Minister of Health, share my concern that in communities like Westbrook, Rednersville, Killaloe, Elmira, Fergus, Hagersville and Nanticoke there is no safe drinking water for the people of the province? Does she not feel that is her responsibility at all?

Hon Mrs Caplan: While in the preamble to the first question I said that I agreed with some of the things the member opposite said, in the preamble to her supplementary question I do not agree with her at all. I believe the Ministry of the Environment has been very active and progressive in responding appropriately to communities across this province. I know we get the advice of public health officials and that the Ministry of Health supports the Ministry of the Environment in its efforts to ensure that the people of Ontario have access to drinking water which is of an appropriate standard, as set by the federal government.

Both ministries are working very actively in making representations to the federal government and I assure the member of our commitment on this very important matter.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr Philip from the standing committee on public accounts presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Report No. 1.

The Speaker: The member may wish to inform us slightly on what the recommendations are.

Mr Philip: I never inform anybody slightly, but I will inform you concisely, Mr Speaker.

The Provincial Auditor's report on the audit of the personnel classification system of the Human Resources Secretariat, Management Board of Cabinet, was investigated by our committee on 5 March and 8 March 1990. The committee made a number of recommendations in this report and we have assigned dates by which we expect the Human Resources Secretariat to provide progress reports.

This committee is of the opinion that this report on the Human Resources Secretariat's classification system is of importance to both management in the Ontario public service and to the Ontario Public Service Employees Union. The members have decided therefore to forward a copy of their report and the Hansard to OPSEU, and we hope OPSEU will also provide comments.

On motion by Mr Philip, the debate was adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

LIQUOR LICENCE ACT, 1990 LOI DE 1990 SUR LES PERMIS DE VENTE D'ALCOOL

Mr Phillips, on behalf of Mr Sorbara, moved first reading of Bill 175, An Act to revise the Liquor Licence Act and to amend the law relating to Liquor.

M. Phillips, au nom de M. Sorbara, propose la première lecture du projet de loi 175, Loi portant révision de la Loi sur les permis de vente d'alcool et portant modification des lois relatives à l'alcool.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUSINESS NAMES ACT, 1989

Mr Phillips, on behalf of Mr Sorbara, moved second reading of Bill 108, An Act respecting Business Names.

Mr Laughren: Mr Speaker, on a point of order or privilege: I wonder if we could have an opening statement from the minister.

The Speaker: I know the members are very interested in an opening statement. I see the minister is here now, so I will recognize the minister.

Hon Mr Sorbara: My apologies to my colleagues in the House. Apparently, Mr Speaker, you moved through petitions, motions and introduction of bills in an entirely orderly fashion, and we are now dealing with the second reading of Bill 208.

Hon Mr Phillips: Bill 108.

Hon Mr Sorbara: I am sorry, Bill 108.

There is not a great deal to say on this bill other than that, after a great deal of consultation with all the people who have an interest in this bill—and that is generally the business community and the legal community, which does the work of incorporation, which does the work of forming a partnership if a business is going to be carried on in the form of a partnership—it puts the law relating to the creation and use of business names into a modern and appropriate state.

One of the things this bill does is that it acknowledges in statutory form the fact that we have moved from an economy that was generally a goods-producing economy to an economy that has a very significant service sector component as well. One of the things Bill 108 does is require that all business entities, notwithstanding that they are a service sector business, must register a business name if they are going to be using that business name.

1550

Another thing that is important to mention is that the bill, when it is passed, will require a comprehensive registration of all business names in the province so that we will move from a system which is, at best, only sometimes reliable in the searching of business names to a system which will be comprehensive and very highly reliable for the individual who is looking to find the business entity which is behind the business name.

For my friends in the House who perhaps do not understand how this system works, let me just say that a business entity, whether it is a corporation incorporated under our corporations statutes or a partnership which is formed by way of an agreement, can, if it is not using its own name—let's take corporation ABC Ltd. That corporation can carry on business under the name ABC Ltd or it can adopt a business name, for example, Laughren's Calisthenic Shops. If it chooses to use that name, under this act it must register that name. It also must obviously search to find that someone else is not using that name. Indeed, under the new act, when it is passed, if a similar name is used and it is deceptively similar, and the other Laughren is damaged or suffers as a result of the use of the Laughren name for calisthenic shops, then the act provides for damages.

Finally, as result of some careful analysis by our friend in the House, the member for Welland-Thorold, pointing out a couple of matters that needed some more attention, a number of amendments will be proposed to Bill 108 when it goes before committee of the whole. They are really rather technical amendments ensuring that the law is absolutely clear that a business name, not only in the English language but the French language and any other language, can be used as long as appropriate characters known to our society are used.

The long and the short of it is that a great deal of work has been done among client groups, and particularly lawyers representing businesses, to ensure that we will have in the province, when Bill 108 is passed, a modern statute which gives a very high degree of reliability for people trying to search the user of a business name. Once this act is passed, the machinery to put it into place will be set in motion, and I am confident that we will have a very good statute indeed.

Mr Farnan: We will be supporting the legislation today. I find it rather amusing that the minister would say that this bill will make the whole process absolutely clear, especially after a team of lawyers has been working on this for a period of time. I have read the legislation and, of course, not being of the legal profession myself, I do not find it absolutely clear. For those individuals who are in corporations or businesses that have the

benefit of legal advisers, those boards of directors may find the legislation absolutely clear after it is explained to them by their legal staff and legal departments, but I assure you, Mr Speaker, for the layman, any legislation can often appear to be quite complicated. Effort, I believe, should be made in all of the legislation to produce a language that is readable and understandable to the average citizen and to the small business people of the province, because often legislation indeed comes in a language that defies understanding.

I do want to make one comment, and that is, in talking about Bill 108, I just want to make absolutely sure, and the minister will give his assurance, that this is the case. My colleague the member for Welland-Thorold brought to my attention as critic, and I believe to the ministry, our concern with a particular clause that suggested, "A name may be registered only in English and French or English and French combined," and we pointed out that certainly we would like to see the possibility for other languages to be used in the name of a business, whether it be Italian, Portuguese or any other language.

The ministry indicated to me that it has accepted this and it has brought forward the amendment to address our concerns, with the understandable reality that it can only go so far as to accept names that are in the generally accepted characters of the alphabet as we use it, and that, I believe, is supported by the New Democratic Party.

In the final analysis, although this is very much a housekeeping bill to bring in order and some kind of efficiency, I do not think we can take the stance that it is just wonderful legislation. Legislation often only can be evaluated when we look at it in practice, see how it works, see if it doing the job, look at what wrinkles come about later on as we watch the legislation applied. Therefore we just say to the minister, as I expect he will be looking at how it works, we support it at this particular stage. We will monitor it. We hope it works. I know a lot of work has gone into it. The minister and his staff have put a lot of work into this, and certainly we support it. We will monitor it and we will get back to the minister with any concerns of ours that arise.

Ms Bryden: I support the idea of this bill, which is to streamline our procedures for registering companies and examining whether names have duplication or should be questioned. At the same time, I want to say that I think the bill will only be as good as its administration, and I have found that the administration of the companies legislation and the registering of companies thereunder is less than what one might call excellent or even good.

I found when I phoned the companies branch for registration information on some companies in the east end that I was interested in, who their owners were or who their shareholders were if they were a share company, the companies branch came up with a complete blank on two of them, and yet I could see their storefronts within a mile of my home or my constituency office. I wonder how those companies are allowed to operate there without any registration. They could not even tell who the owner was, or they had just no file on them at all.

Also, in one or two others in which I did get the names of the proprietor in whose name the company was registered, I could not get any information about other owners or other shareholders, if there were such. It appears that most of these companies are not subject to any very definite supervision.

1600

We all know that in the past 10 years there have been a great many companies which were originally registered and then their registry lapsed and they have had to have private bills to resurrect the companies because no efforts were really made to collect their annual reports or any fees that are required when those reports are received.

I know there have been some improvements in the reporting process, but I still think there are too many companies that we can find out very little about, operating in this area anyway. I do not know about the rest of the province.

Also, there are too many companies operating under numbers. Behind the numbers, you cannot always get the names of the actual owners. Certainly you cannot get them posted in apartment blocks, where the owners often are a numbered company. It seems to require a great deal of digging for the tenants to find out who the people behind the number are, and also for anybody doing research who wants to find out what companies are joined with other companies in the ownership of a numbered company.

I hope the minister will be looking into the administration of this bill and of the whole companies' legislation to make sure that it is easy for us to monitor the operations of the act, that there is some sort of annual financial statement and that there is the ability to find out who are the people behind the numbers.

With that reservation, I am willing to support second reading of this bill, but I hope the minister will give us some sort of statement on what kind of administration he plans.

Hon Mr Sorbara: Just to wrap up second reading debate, I appreciate the support of the two speakers and the support of the New Democratic Party on this bill.

I note the absence of anyone from the Conservative Part to speak to it. I hope they will support it as well, if they care to participate in the vote.

To answer my friend the member for Cambridge, the matter that his colleague the member for Welland-Thorold raised in respect of the use of a broader range of names has been incorporated in a number of amendments that I will put before committee of the whole. I think they will pass easily. Simply, they reflect that concern, and I think we have reshaped the bill in order to do that.

To my friend the member for Beaches-Woodbine, I simply want to say that all of the things she would like to see changed in the area of company law, even if I were completely sympathetic with all her views, could not be incorporated in an act like this. But I think she will be satisfied when she sees this act put into place and the machinery to do what the act proposes to do put into place.

The business of searching behind a business name, whatever that business name is, will be made easier. It is not written up in the statute, but there will be a technology incorporated within my ministry to make the registration process and the searching process simpler and more effective. For example, if you want to search behind a company and you need to know who the principals are or what the corporate entity is or who the individual behind that business name is, hopefully, when this act is passed and the new machinery of registration is put into place, that process will be easier.

The other matters that she raised, I think, are really part and parcel of consideration under statutes and there may be a time and a place for that as well.

I want to thank both of them for their comments on the bill and I hope we can deal with this expeditiously.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

Hon Mr Sorbara: If I might, on behalf of the House leader, my understanding was that we were going to do a number of bills on the order paper and then go to committee of the whole after that. Is that wrong?

The Deputy Speaker: That is correct.

EASEMENT STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1989

Mr Sorbara moved second reading of Bill 106, An Act to amend certain Acts with respect to Easements and other matters.

Hon Mr Sorbara: Very briefly, Bill 106 is a rather technical bill and I do not want to spend a lot of time dealing with the technicalities of it. Suffice it to say that what this bill does is provide to municipalities, at the request of municipalities and in response to some of the concerns that municipalities have about the registration of their easements in land registration offices around the province, an additional 10 years to re-register very old easements which, in the absence of this bill, would simply disappear and lose their legal effect over land.

For the benefit of my friends who might not have much history on this bill, easements can arise in a variety of forms. Under the registry system, they might arise by a reference in a completely unrelated document. Back in 1981 the government saw fit, in beginning the creation of the Polaris system, the province of Ontario land registration and information system, a process of requiring that any easement held by a municipality, or anyone else for that matter, had to be on title as a result of a notice on the particular property that the easement affected. That affected thousands and thousands of municipal easements, things like utility corridors and easements for sewer pipes and water and all of that sort of thing.

The intention at that time was to have those easements registered by a notice on title on the property affected. That process has not been completed yet and, rather than have municipalities lose their rights in those easements, we have provided under this act an additional 10 years, really until 1999, for those registrations to take place. It has been done in consultation with municipalities and I know that they are awaiting the passage of this act, so I encourage my friends in the House to support it and give it speedy consideration and speedy passage.

Mr Farnan: The minister has summed up the legislation. It does provide a 10-year grace for municipalities to reserve easements. I would like to point out to the minister that since 1981 many municipalities have never bothered to relocate and register their easements. I would like the minister to answer this question when he responds: How does he feel this legislation will encourage municipalities to get on with the job of registering their easements? I think that is an important question.

There has been a period between 1981 and the present in which many municipalities have not registered, and this is an additional 10 years. Is this a very efficacious way in which to proceed, that we look at a 20-year period in which we have easements registered? I am not going to say it is or it is not; I am just looking for the minister's views on this. Is there a process by which it could be done more effectively so that all of this could be in the data bank within a reasonable period of time? Is 20 years an overly long period in which to have this

process completed? What guarantees do we have that by 1990 it will be in place? I am just interested in the minister's views.

It is obvious that we support this legislation. I think municipalities will appreciate the period of grace. I am looking at the period of grace as being quite extraordinary, in the sense that it is a 10-year period of grace. However, I suppose that given the relationship of the government to municipalities over many issues, the government might be looking for something with which to placate municipalities, even if it is on this small piece of legislation. I look forward to the minister's comments.

1610

Hon Mr Sorbara: In summing up this mini-debate on Bill 106, I want to direct myself exclusively to the comments of my friend the member for Cambridge. He suggests that 10 years or 20 years to have these notices of easements registered is too long a period. I think probably the previous government in 1981 suggested that 10 years was long enough in the legislation that it proposed. Unfortunately, the municipalities either did not or would not get the work done.

I understand that, because in many instances to register these easements in the way that the law now requires or will require over the number of years can be a very expensive process. We talk about it as the simple registration of an easement, but to understand it in technical terms, it may mean the surveying of a right of way for a water line to traverse perhaps half a mile of private property. That is the kind of thing we are talking about.

Often, let's be frank, the municipality is unaware that it still has the easement, and the question does not arise until some time in the future, when a property is being transferred or a new pipeline is being put in or that sort of thing. So what has to happen to register these easements in many cases is very expensive survey work has to be undertaken, new plans have to be drawn, and then of course the document has to be registered. A good deal of that work is done, but in order not to in any way inadvertently void the easements that are necessary for municipalities to continue to do what they do in many instances, we have seen fit to provide another 10-year period.

I just want to point out in that regard that any private property owner who happens to be affected by this bill is, under the terms of the bill, to be compensated by the municipality. We do not expect that is going to happen in a great number of cases, but we wanted to satisfy ourselves as we move into this last period for registering these easements that no one is prejudiced by the extension of time. We have done that with an appropriate amendment.

I just want to reiterate that in passing this legislation we are putting into place yet another important component of Polaris, the province of Ontario land registration and information system, that is going to really revolutionize our land registration system in the province. The fact that we are speeding up that process with a strategic alliance with a private sector partner means that this system will put us at the leading edge of land registration technologies in the future.

It really will be necessary for municipalities to comply with this 10-year period, because we expect that at the end of that 10-year period we will have a new land registration system in the province, technologically driven and computer based, that will be the envy of every other jurisdiction in North America. This is an important part of it, and I thank members for their support of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

MINING TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1989

Mr Mancini moved second reading of Bill 104, An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act.

Hon Mr Mancini: I have an opening statement, but very short. An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act basically implements the proposal in the Treasurer's budget of 17 May 1989 requiring mine operators to pay monthly instalments of mining tax for taxation years commencing after that date. It also reinstates an administrative penalty of \$50 per day for non-filing of tax returns. This was omitted in error during the over-haul of the act in 1987.

Mr Laughren: I just wanted to ask the minister—this is not in debate now, but simply a question to the minister—whether he could tell us, if this bill flowed from the previous budget, why it has taken the minister so long to get it before the assembly.

Mr Pollock: I have a couple of things. One question is, how does this affect a mine that possibly might be shut down for a long period of time with a labour dispute? Another question is, since the minister mentioned that they will be paying a tax of \$50 for each day they are in arrears, how does that compare with former legislation? Is it in any way near the same amount? Would the minister please explain clause 18(2)(b) in section 4, "an amount equal to the lesser of \$1,000 or 10%"?

Hon Mr Mancini: There are three short questions. My friend the member for Nickel Belt wanted to know why it has taken so long to get the matter before the House. It has taken so long because of all the scrutiny that all the legislation must go through. This is a very open government, as my honourable colleague knows, and many, many bills are introduced that probably could proceed quickly. The members of the opposition want to earn their salaries, justifiably so, and they want to scrutinize everything very thoroughly in the House. Actually I think they do not do too bad a job doing that. That does slow down the process somewhat, but I think it is worth while in order for the scrutiny to take place.

My friend speaking on behalf of the Conservative Party wanted some clarification on the \$50. I think it is just being handed to me right now, but the \$50 is comparable to the late payments, for example, on the employer health tax. That is a comparable rate. The honourable gentleman asked what "the lesser of \$1,000 or 10%" of the unpaid tax means. I would assume that if there were money owing, it would be exactly that: it would be the lesser of \$1,000 or 10%. I do not know how much more clear it could be.

The notes sent to me from my officials tell me that if a mine is shut down—

Mr Laughren: They are not your officials. They are ours.

Hon Mr Mancini: Our officials, officials of the government that members opposite are always criticizing in the Legislature all the time.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. The minister's time is up.

Hon Mr Mancini: My time is up? I wanted to answer the honourable gentleman's question, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Do other members wish to participate in the debate? The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr Laughren: Yes, I do. I appreciated that aborted explanation from the Minister of Revenue. I must say that when I looked at the bill and I realized way back when, when they talked about an amendment to the Mining Tax Act, for a wild and crazy moment I got excited and I thought we were going to have a meaningful amendment to the act that would benefit communities in northern Ontario that have mining companies within their jurisdiction.

When I think of all the possible amendments that the minister could have brought before us, this is the one that I find the most unlikely for him to have dreamed up to bring for debate and passage. We could spend a full week in this assembly debating meaningful amendments to the Mining Tax Act. Most of us who represent constituencies in which there are mining operations could have filled the minister's ear with suggestions. Indeed, we often have in the past.

We would have thought that if the minister was going to amend the Mining Tax Act, he would have incorporated some of those suggestions into his amendment package. Instead of that, we have an amendment that simply says to the mining companies, "Instead of paying all your taxes at the end of the year, now we want your revenue every month." That is basically what the amendment does, and a few other amendments attached to that.

1620

We know, for example, that this year there is almost \$200 million budgeted for revenues from the mining sector. If others obviously have not done it, it is time that this minister put his stamp on the industry with his own kind of Mining Tax Act. There is absolutely no reason why we have to go on with the kind of tax regime we have in northern Ontario with the mining companies.

For example, this minister is responsible for assessment. He is also responsible for the legislation on mining tax revenues. Why would he not come forth with a package that changes the way in which mining properties are assessed when they are either inside or outside municipal boundaries? When he was going through this, and he had a year to do it, why did he not bring before us a substantial amendment that said, "We are going to change the assessment so that mining companies pay more to the municipalities in which they are located," even if they are just outside the boundaries of the municipality?

When I think of the community in which I live, the regional municipality of Sudbury—anyone ever taking the time to read any kind of resource economics would note that there has never been a textbook written, I suspect, that did not refer to the incredible wealth of the Sudbury basin. Yet when you look at the Sudbury basin and you see the problems we have had, the struggles we have had simply to maintain basic services, which are still not there in the entire community, then it speaks volumes about the kind of tax system we have in this province.

It really does puzzle me. I hope when the minister winds up debate on this bill, he will tell us why it is that he did not attempt a more meaningful and substantial amendment to the legislation. I am puzzled by it. The mining companies themselves are not opposed to a change in the way they pay their taxes. If the minister really feels he does not want to offend the corporate sector, then that is fine. Let him at least change the direction of the money that is extracted from the mining industry. Why not have more of the money that is raised from them stay at the local level?

Virtually all mining communities have particular problems, partly because they are in northern Ontario, partly because

some of them are isolated or partly because of the nature, for example in Sudbury, of the rock on which we are located. All services are very expensive to deliver in that community. There is no reason why the minister could not have come before this assembly with an appropriate package of amendments that would have meant something to people in northern Ontario.

What does the minister think this bill means to any resident in any mining municipality? Does he really think it makes a difference if the companies pay their bills once a month instead of once a year? Is that going to benefit the regional municipality of Sudbury? Is that going to benefit Timiskaming with all its problems? Or Timmins? It is not going to make things a bit better in those communities.

If the minister is going to muck around with the Mining Tax Act, why does he not do it in a meaningful way? This way, he is going through the motions as a minister and he can say, "Well, I passed a Mining Tax Act amendment today or this session or during the life of this Parliament." But what did it really do? He had an opportunity to do something meaningful that would have benefited the municipalities in northern Ontario where there are mining operations.

As I said, the mining companies would not have opposed it. They are not looking to pay more taxes, but I am sure that virtually every mining company would be willing to have some of its taxes redirected to the local level rather than to the consolidated revenue fund down here in Toronto. I do not expect them to say they want to pay more money.

What I am saying to the minister is that if he does not want to direct some of the mining tax profits back to the local municipalities, then it seems to me he should change the Assessment Act. That is within his power too. It is not within my purview to debate that this afternoon with this bill, Mr Speaker, I hasten to add before you interrupt me, but I really am disappointed in the minister's amendment.

We will vote for the amendment because all it does is say the companies pay once a month instead of once a year. But tell me why we would take the time of this assembly to spend a lot of time debating that. I do not know. I am surprised this was not in the form of a change in the regulations. That is how important I think it is. I hope when the minister responds he has some kind of explanation of why he comes in with a piece of legislation that will not alter the wellbeing of any resident in the province—absolutely none—yet he has an amendment before the House.

It seems to me I have heard ministers complain that it is difficult to get their legislation before the assembly because of the backlog of legislation. If that is the case, when they do get a bill before us why do they not make it worth while? Why do they not make it a bill that we all feel good about debating? Whether or not we would all agree on it is not the point, but at least if they are going to bring in a bill to amend an existing piece of legislation, for heaven's sake, make it worth our while to do so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Cureatz): If memory serves me correctly in watching the monitor, we are dealing with second reading of Bill 104, An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act. Questions and responses? Continuing with the debate and waiting a sumptuous amount of time, the honourable member for Hastings-Peterborough.

Mr Pollock: I think the minister was about to answer that question about what happened if there was a lengthy labour dispute. He never really got that out, so possibly when he gives us a response he will mention that. I mentioned the \$50. I know

that is what it is right now and I really do not have a problem with that. I want to know what they charged for a penalty in the past. That is what I was concerned about.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member stood up in questions and responses. My understanding is that he has already participated in the debate. I would anticipate the minister would rather not participate in questions and responses but reserve his comments for his summation at second reading. So we will still cast our eyes about to see if there is any further discussion with the bill on second reading. Seeing none, the minister's concluding remarks.

Hon Mr Mancini: In my concluding statement, I will try to answer some of the questions and comments that have been made.

First, I think it would be fair to respond to my Conservative colleague who has asked now twice about what the situation would be if a labour dispute was in effect at a certain mine and affected the operations. I am assuming if that was the case and if the dispute was for any particular length of time, then the company's profits would be lower and therefore the mining taxes would be lower. That is basically how the situation would be affected by a labour dispute.

Also, the honourable gentleman opposite asked what the previous fine was. I believe the previous fine was \$50 and I believe it was left out of the previous legislation. Then I tried to compare that with the employer health tax, which is also \$50 a day in penalty if the filing is late. I think those two answers in fact might serve the honourable member.

My friend the member for Nickel Belt asks a different kind of question. He asks more of a philosophical, economic question, probably a question that would be more appropriately directed to the Treasurer, who sets economic policy for Ontario. The member for Nickel Belt started off by indicating, in my view, that mining taxes were in fact too low. He certainly left that impression. I am not sure if there is widespread belief in northern Ontario or anywhere else that mining taxes are in fact too low, but if they were, that would be a question for the Treasurer to decide. He sets economic policy and he sets tax rates. My colleague the member for Nickel Belt, who has been in the Legislature for a long number of years—

1630

Mr Sola: Too long some would say.

Hon Mr Mancini: Some members have said too long—and who on a regular basis asks the Treasurer questions, knows who sets economic policy.

Then, in his concluding remarks, he seemed to indicate that these increased taxes he wanted placed on the mining industry should not come to the coffers here at Queen's Park but should be paid to the local municipalities. That is an interesting idea indeed. I am not sure how the honourable member would put that in place. Maybe in the not-too-distant future he will get the opportunity to stand on a platform in northern Ontario and indicate just how high he would raise mining taxes and, when he did raise these taxes, how he would divert this money to the local municipalities. We will look forward to hearing from the honourable member in the not-too-distant future, or maybe even later on today, as to how this would happen.

I also want to say that I know my friend the member for Nickel Belt would be the first member on the opposition side in the House from northern Ontario to stand and say that something should be done for the industry if in fact there was a downturn in the economy and how a higher tax rate would

particularly affect the industry at this time when there is some feeling and in fact some justification for concern expressed by workers, by people in the industry and by companies that manage the industry as to what the future holds as far as being able to work within a strong economy is concerned.

So I would say to the honourable member that this particular piece of legislation is not any more or any less than what it purports to be. It purports to be an explanation as to how mining companies will remit their taxes. That is basically what this piece of legislation does. That is very important to the Ministry of Revenue. It is very important for us to be able to inform the Treasurer as to how funds are coming in. It is very important for the government to know, because during in-year reviews of ministerial expenses it is nice to know whether there is room to manoeuvre, whether there is room for further expansion in government programs or whether we are going to have to hold the line very tightly.

That is basically running the store well and that is basically what this piece of legislation is going to help us do. It is going to help us run the store better. I know the New Democrats, the socialists, are not concerned about that. Frankly, the honourable member's suggestion today, that taxes should be raised on the industry and then given to the municipalities, is a very novel idea. We will await further explanation as to just how high he would raise these taxes and which municipalities would get how much from these new taxes.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

ONTARIO HOME OWNERSHIP SAVINGS PLAN AMENDMENT ACT, 1989

Mr Mancini moved second reading of Bill 105, An Act to amend the Ontario Home Ownership Savings Plan Act, 1988.

Hon Mr Mancini: I had a short statement about this particular piece of legislation earlier on today and I was happy to see that it was applauded from all sides.

Mr Laughren: No, it wasn't. What are you talking about?

Hon Mr Mancini: Yes, it was applauded from all sides. I am happy to have an occasion here this afternoon to comment further on this important and positive piece of legislation.

This bill, An Act to amend the Ontario Home Ownership Savings Plan Act, 1988, implements the changes to the Ontario home ownership savings plan program for the first-time home buyers. This arises out of the Treasurer's budget of 17 May 1989.

These changes, designed to enhance the attractiveness of this program, are as follows: (1) higher-yield fixed-term investments, such as guaranteed investment certificates, are now eligible investments in addition to demand deposits; (2) the early release of plan deposits is now allowed when a buyer has agreed to make interim payments to a builder as part of the agreement to purchase and sell; (3) planholders who acquire an interest in a home as a result of a marriage or inheritance are no longer required to pay back any tax credits received in previous years; and (4) an individual whose spouse owned a home prior to, but not after, the marriage is now eligible to participate in the Ontario home ownership savings plan program.

This bill also contains some administrative changes to clarify the wording of certain definitions, the conditions for the creation of an OHOSP and a time limitation for the prosecutions of offences committed under the act. A technical amend-

ment is also proposed to prevent individuals from abusing the program in trust situations.

With the concurrence of my colleague the Attorney General, a complementary amendment to the Succession Law Reform Act is included in this bill. This amendment would allow OHOSPs to be included in the definition of a plan under the act and enable an OHOSP planholder to designate a beneficiary of the plan in a signed statement. Presently, a beneficiary may only be appointed by means of a will.

I will propose amendments to Bill 105 that will exclude from the program homes that have been illegally converted from rental property in contravention of the Rental Housing Protection Act. Copies of the proposed amendments will be distributed to the honourable members, and I look forward to their assistance and to their comments.

Mr Laughren: I wonder if we could have some questions and answers first, before we get into debate. Is that appropriate?

The Acting Speaker: Well, that is not the way these things are done, as the honourable member, who is much more learned than I am in the proceedings of the House, will know; but maybe during comments and questions.

Mr Charlton: Could we have unanimous consent to have questions and comments?

Mr Laughren: It is all right. I shall engage in the debate on second reading. The question I was going to ask the minister, if I had had the opportunity earlier, was whether or not it is usual to bring forward an act to amend the Ontario Home Ownership Savings Plan Act and then at the very end of it say he is also amending the Succession Law Reform Act. Is this the normal procedure, to bring in a bill amending an act right in the title of the bill and then at the end of it tack on an amendment to an act that is not even mentioned in the title of the bill? I would appreciate hearing what the minister says on that. However, I will not dwell on that. That is just one of those in-House matters that one likes to have cleared up.

The Acting Speaker: I have made an error. Actually, we could have questions and comments. I apologize for that.

Mr Laughren: That is what I was suggesting, Mr Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Yes, and I do humbly apologize—because last week we had, strangely enough, turmoil in the House because of time allocation and we did not have questions and comments on second reading. Anyway, it slipped my mind. We are in questions and comments. I was just thinking, if the honourable member would like to use two minutes for questions and comments, then we would go back to the minister to have an answer and then go into second reading debate. Okay?

1640

Mr Laughren: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I would simply ask the minister to respond to the question I put, as to the purpose of adding on to this bill an amendment to another act that is not referred to in the title of the bill. I am asking that question not because I am necessarily opposed to it, but simply on the protocol of doing it in that way.

Mr Cousens: I would like the minister to explain why he is bringing in the amendment now to Bill 105. I do not have a lot of problems with some of the points in the bill, but he has really missed the major point. Why is it he did not look at increasing the maximum to something greater than \$2,000 per year or \$4,000 per couple? Why did he not touch on the real

core of the problem with the Ontario home ownership savings plan rather than just some of the other things?

The other changes he has made would begin to make some sense if he changes the value that the bill will have on people buying a first home, but what he has really done is sort of play with the bill; maybe not the minister but the people who do all the thinking in his ministry, and they are the ones who really should be held responsible for it.

I do not want to cast any aspersions on the minister, but he cannot sit down and figure out all this stuff. That is done by the bureaucrats—the civil servants and the deputy minister. These ministers change from week to week and month to month. You do not know who is going to be the minister. We lost one last week; we could lose another one next week. One does not really know who does the homework around there. It sure is not the ministers because they are just coming and going, and they are looking over their shoulder wondering who the Premier is going to move in or out next.

In spite of the fact that the Minister of Revenue is still there after this short period of time, and even while I am still speaking he is still sitting there, I would like to know why he did not do anything about the maximum as is related to in this bill, because that is the one thing that, if he had changed it, would begin to have credibility as far as helping out people who are buying a new home.

The Acting Speaker: We will have time for questions and comments in rotation.

Mr Cousens: Do I have any more?

The Acting Speaker: No, you do not.

Hon Mr Mancini: My friend the member for Nickel Belt wanted to know why there was mention in this piece of legislation in regard to the Succession Law Reform Act, and I want to explain to him that this complementary amendment, to include OHOSP as a plan under the Succession Law Reform Act, is so that a planholder may designate a beneficiary of the plan assets by means of a signed statement. I understand that this is not breaking with protocol, and I understand that when matters are of a complementary nature and when they are related, this has in fact been done before.

My colleagues from across the floor indicate that they would like to see a more significant program, I guess a program where more people would qualify, and qualify for more funds. I would say to my friend the member for Markham that we hear a lot from his party about reducing the costs of government, but every time we get into a specific piece of legislation we hear from him and his colleagues about increasing the size and expenditures of government.

I do not know how he will be able to reconcile that, but I believe that the OHOSP program has in fact been successful, and our statistics, which have not been challenged, bear this out. I said to all honourable members today that to date over 83,000 perspective home buyers have opened plans, 83,000 people who hope to own a home in the near future have opened plans, and 26,000 first homes have been financed partly by this program. A lot of individuals have taken advantage of this program and have used it to their benefit. That is why it was introduced, to assist people with their first homes.

Mr Laughren: Before we get into the debate, I will say that I am not sure that the minister is entirely correct in his explanation of attaching a complementary amendment. We will deal with that later, I assume.

I am also not sure, on the statistics he uses, how many of those people he talks about actually end up buying a home as a result of this plan as opposed to those people who simply go into the plan, perhaps with good intentions, but simply put money aside. To what extent those people actually end up owning a home as a result of this program I do not know, but we will be after the minister to provide those numbers.

As I read the bill, the main amendments are as follows:

First, a planholder in the Ontario home ownership savings plan can terminate the plan without repaying tax credits if he or she either inherits a home, receives a home by way of a gift or marries a person who already owns a home. I think that is appropriate. I would not be opposed to that amendment.

Second, a planholder can release plan assets to make interim payments to a builder under an agreement to purchase a home. I think that is also a reasonable change to the existing legislation.

Third, a person can become a planholder even though his or her spouse previously owned a home prior to their marriage. I see no problem with that change either.

Fourth, financial institutions can now offer fixed-term investments as well as demand deposits for plan asset investment. I see nothing wrong with that either.

But the next major change bothers me and my colleagues: An eligible home now includes a partial interest in a multi-residential property if it carries the right to occupy a unit of the building. That is my understanding of the proposed amendment. That bothers me because part of the Ministry of Housing's rental housing protection branch is supposed to prevent the conversion of rental housing into ownership in order to protect the rental market, and here we have this program now deeming equity co-op purchasers to be eligible for financial assistance from the government. This seems to me to be, in a back-door kind of way, encouraging conversion from rental to ownership. We all like to engage in some ownership in this world, but I think that the government has to be more up front about how we do it, that this is not the right way to do it.

We believe that the ministry has no plans to do any kind of screening on this form of conversion of equity co-op purchasers, and unless the ministry has some evidence that screening has been set up to look after this potential problem, then certainly I would not be prepared to support this piece of legislation. I hope that the minister will think about that.

A major problem, of course, is that it simply does not touch the real problem of housing in this province. We know that the program is aimed at home buyers with incomes of up to \$40,000 per annum or, if it is a couple, \$80,000 for the family. Of course, there are graduated tax credits, depending on their income.

The minister should know, and I suspect that he does know, about the price of homes in Metropolitan Toronto. The last time I looked, I believe the average price of a home in Toronto was over \$250,000, around \$270,000. That is why I cannot imagine a \$40,000-a-year person—that is the limit; it is not my limit, it is the government's—how you can imagine somebody at \$40,000 a year putting money into this program with the dream of owning a \$271,000 home. That is just the average price. There are some lower than that, sure, but how can someone at \$40,000 a year ever really take advantage of this? I assume they can put money into the program on a regular basis, but that does not mean they are going to end up owning a home as a result of putting that money aside.

1650

The minister also pointed out earlier this afternoon in his statement that the land transfer tax credit also applies and that the maximum amount of credit for the land transfer tax is \$1,225. If you add the \$1,225 for the land transfer tax and the maximum amount for the OHOSP credits, then you end up with something like \$1,700 maximum credit for the combination of the two programs. If I am wrong on those numbers, I am sure the minister will correct me. That is not going to alter many people's decision on a home that is in excess of \$200,000, and it is very difficult to purchase a home at less than that, particularly in southern Ontario, more particularly in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

An hon member: How about Nickel Belt?

Mr Laughren: Even in Nickel Belt.

It is not that the bill is a harmful bill, except in that one area I referred to about conversion from rental to ownership, but it is the fact that it simply did not raise the—I wondered why the minister did not take the opportunity to change the income levels on the eligibility criteria.

The other thing, of course, is that the minister can bring in all the OHOSP plans he and his officials can dream up—he and our officials—but in the end, as long as the government sits there and watches the land development industry raise the price of houses at an obscene rate, then all of these programs are just nibbling at the edges. The price of homes since those people came to government has gone up dramatically. That is no coincidence. They know who their friends are out there. So the prices skyrocket and they bring in a plan like this that does so pathetically little for those people who still have a dream of owning a home in this province.

It must be difficult to justify. I know that every time we criticize one of his pieces of legislation, the Minister of Revenue says: "Don't blame me. It's the Treasurer." Well, the Treasurer is not here to answer to this bill. If the minister wants to blame the Treasurer, he should make sure that he is here to respond to our criticisms. The minister cannot have it both ways. He cannot say, "It's not really my bill, it's the Treasurer's," and then the Treasurer is not here.

The minister must make up his mind. Does he want the Treasurer to deal with his bills or does he want to deal with them? If he is going to deal with them, then he should deal with the criticisms that flow from them, because it is simply not appropriate in every matter of policy for him to simply pass the buck back to the Treasurer, who of course can stand in his place and say: "That's a Ministry of Revenue bill. Go talk to him." The way they are dealing with these bills is not appropriate.

If, on the one hand, he does not wish to be Minister of Revenue any more, then he should say so. On the other hand, if he still wants to be Minister of Revenue and accrue therefrom all the perks that flow from such an onerous task, then fine, he must then carry out his responsibilities as well as accepting the perks, and—

Interjections.

Mr. Laughren: —I am not even talking about his limo. I am talking about other, more important things. I do not care about his limo. I do not care if he rides in that limo day and night. I do not care if he lives in his limo; that is not important. I do not care if he has got an OHOSP grant for his limo; that is not my problem. I do not think his limo is important in this debate and I do not think we should even be talking about his limo, because it has nothing to do with this bill.

I would simply say to the minister, however, that this is the second bill this afternoon that he has come in with that simply nibbled at the edge of a problem and I am disappointed in that regard. I thought that on the previous bill, the mining bill, there were some substantial changes he could have brought in, and there were some substantial changes he could have made on this bill as well. In both cases we find him wanting.

It is true, I know, that the minister does not set all government monetary and economic policy. On the other hand, when someone comes to him with a suggestion and he knows that he is going to have to defend it, why does he not say: "Look, give me something I can get my teeth into. Don't give me this shell of legislation. Give me something real"? I want this minister to make his mark in this assembly and he is not going to do it with legislation like this. I would hope the minister would stop his buck-passing game with the Treasurer and insist that from now on if the Treasurer wants him to do his dirty work, he had better give him something of substance to work with, not these pieces of legislation. They really do not mean very much.

In a way I feel sorry for the minister, despite his limo. I do not think it is right that he should have to deal with this kind of legislation that he really cannot justify. He cannot justify taking up the time of this assembly, when we are hard pressed for time with other pieces of legislation, to bring in two bills before us both of which are of very little content. I hope to get a commitment from this minister that this is the last time we will see a piece of legislation brought in by him that has so little content in it.

I cannot vote for this piece of legislation, even though it does not have much content. The little that it does have is not good; namely, the encouragement of conversion from rental to ownership when we are in desperate straits for rental accommodation in this province. Yet the minister comes in with a piece of legislation that encourages conversion from rental to ownership. That is not appropriate. I would hope the minister would have an explanation as to why he has done that terrible thing.

I do not want to delay or prolong the debate on a matter on which there is so little substance, so I will take my place and listen to the other members speak.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments on the honourable member's debate?

Mr Cousens: I just want to ask the member for Nickel Belt if he would rather see the government not make any changes at all to the bill. I realize the concern he has about the cost of housing and indeed the need for change. I know we would probably share the same view that the present ownership savings plan is insignificant compared to the real cost of a home, but I have trouble with his opposing some of the terms that are outlined in this bill.

It gives a person a chance to get a higher yield on his investment. I think that would be good socialist policy. The planholders who acquire an interest in a home as a result of a marriage: That makes sense. What the member really wants to do is throw out the baby with the bath water. Why does he not try to make some amendments to the bill or something else rather than just oppose it all the time? I think the New Democratic Party has a chance to give some leadership here and I do not see it really doing that much.

Mr Laughren: I would be pleased to respond. First, any meaningful amendment to this bill would be ruled out of order because it would be considered a money bill. The Speaker, I am sure, would descend with both feet very heavily on us if we

tried to move an amendment of substance that cost the Treasury money on the ceilings, for example.

Second—I know the member for Markham does not agree with me in this—I think that if a government says to your community, "We're going to bring into this community a government facility that is going to have six jobs and you should be happy with those six jobs, and at the same time we are going to approve the location of a germ warfare testing centre in this community too," surely to goodness because six are good jobs and the other 300 are dangerous jobs testing for germ warfare, I assume the member for Markham, using his theory or analysis, would say, "Better to have a little bit than none, I guess," and he would go for the package even though it included a germ warfare testing centre in downtown Markham.

1700

I do not like that kind of reasoning and I think it is shoddy logic, and for those reasons I will still continue to oppose this bill because the good aspects of it are outweighed by the bad aspects, which are, namely, encouraging the conversion of much needed rental to ownership. For those reasons we shall be opposing this bill.

Mr Cousens: Before I begin my remarks I want to compliment the member for Nickel Belt. I really do. He is a very persuasive person. The fact of the matter is—

Mr McCague: I agree with him, not you.

Mr Cousens: I could agree with some people on some things and other people on others. The fact of the matter is that I am in the unfortunate position of having been given a little lesson on politics here by my friend the member for Nickel Belt who has been around here an awful lot longer than I have—

Hon Mr Mancini: Too long.

Mr Cousens: —and maybe too long, as the Minister of Revenue says, but I do not think so, because I still live in the hope that in opposition we will do something to persuade the government to change its mind and get it to do what is right. What I see here is the member for Nickel Belt saying, "Look, member for Markham, you are not going to bring in any significant change to this bill because it is a money bill and the Speaker will not let it anyway," and he one-upped me on that answer.

I just happen to think that he has been reading the order book at night and doing his homework and I want to thank him for that. As far as having any more kinds of germs coming into Markham is concerned, I will do everything I can to keep them out. He sort of swung me on that one because that is something he knows more about than I do; that is for sure. Anyone who comes from where he does knows what it is to fight the enemy.

We are dealing with a rather painless bill when you consider what government does. Everything is so lovely and nice and they are really trying to make this a beautiful province for people to enjoy. May it be a place where people can live, put down their roots, have a family, earn a living, pay taxes and allow things to prosper and develop.

During the last several years since the Premier took over at the helm we have seen a lot of change. The minister would have us believe that this home ownership savings plan is one of those magnificent gestures on the part of the government. The fact of the matter is that there are going to be fewer people owning homes in the future than did in the past. You are going to have fewer young people having the hope and expectation of owning their own piece of property and their own home where they can

raise their families and do their thing. It is going to be more and more difficult for them because the cost of buying homes has gone up since this government took power. The ratio of the cost of a home to their income and everything else has gone up.

I am going to come to it in greater detail. This is only a preamble leading up to a tirade on irresponsible government. This bill is really just a small coverup plan to try to make people think the government is doing something for them. I do not think it has done much for them except to make it more difficult and more impossible for young people to own a home. To come along and say that this bill is leading the way and heading in the right direction is hypocrisy.

Mr Laughren: Right on. Hear, hear.

Mr Cousens: My goodness' sake, the member for Nickel Belt agrees. Well, we do agree on some things. The socialist and the right-wing Conservative can agree on some things. I am not that right-wing and he is not that socialist, but the fact is that we are most interested in doing something for people.

I happen to believe that when you look at the record of this government, it is no wonder that it had to do a little something to appeal to the younger voters so that it can have something on the brochure in the next and forthcoming election campaign that says, "I helped young people buy a home, get that investment in land."

That is something we have always dreamed of, but it is going to be more and more difficult in the future to have that dream fulfilled, by virtue of the way in which this government has oppressed the taxpayers of Ontario. It is not hard to look at the data and see why we have this two-bit bill and say it is really something.

We just have to look at the way the tax inflows have come into the province. Since the Peterson government took over the purse-strings of Ontario, personal income taxes have increased from \$6.2 billion in 1984-85 to \$14.5 billion in 1991—an increase of almost two and a half times. That is just an incredible increase in personal taxation.

That accounts for one of the reasons why the government had to come in with a home ownership savings plan, because the people are paying so much out in taxes now, far more than they paid out before, that it will go and give them a little sop, a very fine, small sop, and that is called the Ontario home ownership savings plan. The fact is that the people are paying more out in taxes. If each person in the province of Ontario had more money in his jeans, more money in his pockets to spend, then you would see more investment in the province, more money plowed back into free enterprise and more money plowed into the acquiring of cars, homes, furnishings and the things that make the economy strong. But the only thing that has been strong in these last five years is government investment, the government money, because it has had an increase in taxation from \$6.2 billion to \$14.5 billion in that period of time.

During the same period of time, land transfer taxes have gone up in a phenomenal way. I just have to touch on what some of those numbers are. The land transfer taxes imposed by the Liberal government have inflated the revenues even more. In fact, land transfer taxes in Ontario since 1984-85 have gone up by 354%, again adding to bigger coffers for this government to spend on other things, taking the money away from the person who is buying a new home.

It does not take long to figure out what impact that has. We are talking a land transfer tax in 1984 of \$448. That same tax now, since this government took power, when someone goes to buy that home now, is \$1,570. That is what it was in 1989

anyway—close to \$1,000 more that someone would pay on a \$200,000 home just on land transfer taxes.

So the government comes along and has an Ontario home ownership savings plan, and all it has done is take the money away from them on one hand and it thinks it is doing something on the other hand. It just does not make sense. Mr Speaker, I think you should almost rule the government out of order for just trying to fool most of the people. They are not fooling us. They have not fooled the member for Nickel Belt and they are not going to fool me. The land transfer taxes have increased significantly, and what are they doing with this bill? They are saying, "We have a little chance to help someone buying a new home."

The land transfer taxes in 1984-85 amounted to \$139 million. In 1989-90 the aggregate amount for the province is \$701 million—almost \$1 billion in land transfer taxes. This is the amount you pay when you go and have a property change and you want to have it in your own name. You pay the land transfer tax. It is something you have to pay. The government monitors it closely; you cannot get around it. You pay it and pay it and pay it.

Here we have, on the one hand, a land transfer tax which costs and on the other hand the government is saying: "We're doing you a favour. When you want to buy a new home, we're going to give you this great benefit of having the home ownership savings plan."

Mr McCague: Give out and tax back.

Mr Cousens: That is what they are doing: they are giving taxes back. If they did not tax people in the first place, then they would not have to come along and have this little tax-back special that the Minister of Revenue comes along and touts, and he pretends he is doing us all a favour.

What has happened to retail sales tax inflows to the Ontario government since the Premier and his company of bandits took power in 1984-85? In 1984-85 it was just over \$4 billion in retail sales taxes. During the period of time the Liberal government has been in power, do members know how much the increase in retail sales tax has been, just into the coffers of this government? Nothing close to the kind of money they are throwing back to the Ontario new home buyer, but they have more than doubled the sales tax inflows to this government. By now, in 1989-90, the retail sales tax amounted to \$8.6 billion in the province of Ontario.

1710

In 1990-91 it is going to go up a little less than it did in previous years, because we are now beginning to taste the effects of a very rough economy, but we are talking something in the order of \$8.7 billion. That is a huge increase in money that the province has had: over \$4.7 billion. It is one of the biggest scams one has seen, certainly one of the biggest in my lifetime, when we went from 7% sales tax to 8% sales tax. It was "Oh, how terrible." But people are used to paying it now. The Premier and his group of the Treasurer and the tax collectors say, "The people are used to paying it."

I tell the House, we are going to remind them and remind them and remind them that they are now paying more taxes than they did before and this government has levied them on them. If it did not spend so much on advertising and promotion and did not collect the taxes in the first place, then the people would have a way of investing that money in homes and in other investments. It is reprehensible that this government has come along and collected so much in taxes.

So what has happened to the total tax inflows in the province of Ontario since the Liberal government came to power in 1984-85? Its total tax inflow around then was about \$15 billion. How much have the taxes gone up in four years to 1989-90? I guess it is five years, so we give proper credit to the time frame. In five years, the total taxation in the province of Ontario, all the revenues that have come in to this government, have gone from \$15 billion to over \$31 billion. In five years, it has doubled the intake of this government. Is it any wonder now that it is trying to do something to help the poor, poor person who wants to buy a home? They are just not able to do it by themselves any more, because the government has bled them almost dry. There is not any money left in their pocketbooks.

If we talk about the Red Cross coming along and doing a blood-letting, they would probably be complaining, but the members opposite do it and everybody says, "Oh, well, we're used to it with the government." They are blaming the wrong government when they are saying government is causing inflation. The federal government is in the wrong, but the members opposite are worse by a long shot because no one has bled as much money out of the taxpayers of the province of Ontario as this Liberal government. It is a horrible tax grab. Then we come along and the minister comes forward and says, "Now we're going to do something to help the new home buyer."

So what we have is a program that was announced a few years ago that is in place. It has some problems. I am inclined, unlike the member for Nickel Belt, to support the government in having some of these changes in place. I would like very much to see this fine, outstanding minister of the crown, while he still has the job, do something that counts, and that is increase the amount of money that someone can invest in a vehicle that helps him buy a home.

As it stands right now, all people can put into it is \$2,000 per person per year for five years, so that is \$10,000. If they have someone who is a partner, then that can be doubled to \$20,000, and that is it, no more. Yet the very programs I am talking about have had a significant impact on the cost of a home. If the government had not come along with its land transfer tax increases, \$1,000 of that on a \$200,000 home would not be necessary, because the home would have been that much less expensive. Since this government took power, the cost of housing has gone out of sight. It is becoming less and less possible for a young person to even consider the day will come for him or her to buy that first home. That is criminal.

If there is any dream that we want to have for our young people and for all Canadians, it is that property ownership has to be one of the expectations that is part and parcel of being Canadian. I love the fact that my wife and I own our own home. It is really a significant investment for us. It is our most important investment. I remember the satisfaction we had when we had gone from a rental accommodation town house to buying our first home in Burlington. When I bought that home with my wife's help, together, it was one of those happy times when we hung a picture on the wall and we did not have to worry what the landlord was going to say, we did not have to worry what the neighbour was going to say; it was ours. There is something that we have in our culture and our society about being able to own something. That has a sense of power over our own destiny. If you can keep up the taxes and you can keep up the maintenance and you can keep up the utilities and you can keep the other things up, then owning a home becomes a very meaningful thing.

Yet what has the government done in that period of time? In the last few years, because of their management of the economy

of the province of Ontario, they have pushed the possibility of someone owning their own home further and further and further out of reach. How many people now in the greater Toronto area, as a young couple and young people starting out, will be able to buy their own home?

I get nothing but criticism on all the large home builders up my way. People come along and say: "Look at Canada Homes. Aren't they making a fortune out of it?" I will tell members what they did. There was a time when you could buy a brand-new home in my riding for \$70,000 back in the early 1980s. Then it was \$80,000, and now it has gone up. Those same homes are reselling now for over \$250,000 because of the value of property, because of all the other things that go into it. I am getting into the problem of home ownership, and there is a significant problem.

What I have seen companies like Canada Homes do, and Greenpark and Bramalea and Monarch and some of the smaller builders, is make it possible for people to buy a home, and they did it through a number of things. One was wise land management. They bought up large sections of land. There was good development planning. All we ever do is criticize the builders of homes. I think they have made an investment in our community and our society, and it allowed young people to have a chance to buy a home for the first time—not just young people either; people of all ages moved into our community, and of all cultures, because they saw it as a chance of putting a stake in the ground, their own stake. They then own something.

How many people can come along and buy a new home today for \$200,000 or \$250,000? They cannot do it, and a lot of the reasons why they cannot do it is because this government has not helped them. They did not help them because they have had taxes to the limit, they have bled them dry; there is no money left except to just maybe buy a case of something, get their food in the house. They really are struggling to maintain things. And now more than ever it takes two people in order to survive. A single person just cannot provide for a family any more unless you are really prepared to sacrifice. People are prepared to sacrifice, but even when they have two incomes, it is increasingly difficult to get a home.

What the government has done is place some limits on them. Here they have a program that can result in \$20,000 towards a new home, and if a new home in the greater Toronto area costs you \$200,000, how far is that going to go for them? Are they going to be able to carry a mortgage when they are going to be paying 15% and 16% on a mortgage? What is this government doing to help them on the mortgage costs? Sweet nothing. Neither is the federal government, and if the feds think I am going to take sides with them on what they are doing with interest rates, I am not. I think we are doing something horrible in our society that is making it more and more difficult for people to have ownership of anything, own a car or own furniture or own a refrigerator or own a home.

I want to see people have the right and opportunity to buy a home. Here what we end up having is a government that says: "Hey, we're going to help you buy a home. We've got the Ontario new home ownership savings plan." It is just a bag of shells. It does not come close to meeting the need.

Mr Bossy: This sounds like electioneering.

Mr Cousens: If the member thinks this is electioneering, every day is electioneering in this political business and every one of us has a responsibility to fight for the small guy, and those guys, when they took power, forgot about them. The member for Chatham-Kent has gone in there and he has just let

them in cabinet run things and he does not have any say on it at all.

The Treasurer comes out with his budget and everybody comes along, gives him the old red clap and that is all you get. People are getting sick of it. They want to see some action that is going to help the small guy in this province. If they think this new home ownership plan begins to help, it does not begin to do it, not at all.

I happen to believe that this government has an awful lot it could do to help people buy a home and be affordable, but there are not programs forthcoming from this bunch. There is a real advantage for co-operative homes. There must be some ways in which we could have a cheap lease on government land so that people could build on it and have long-term ownership on the thing, some innovative techniques that would say to a person, "We want you to be able to say that those walls and things are yours," but that is not happening from the Minister of Revenue, from the Minister of Housing or from the Premier's Liberals. They are too busy doing the same old thing and giving more brochures and more literature on it, rather than dealing with the fundamentals of the issue.

1720

Why is it there is not something done about land banking and the government opening up land so that people can build more affordable housing on it? What has happened is that all the land around the greater Toronto area is now owned by a few developers. It is not owned widely. We are not seeing an investment by the government to put another York-Durham pipe in there somewhere else, not that we need another York-Durham pipe in the same position, but where is the next place where they are going to have growth in the area?

Mr McCague: Where is the planning?

Mr Cousens: Where is the long-term planning? The Minister of Revenue is going to say: "That's not my responsibility. No, no, that falls on the back of one of my staffers," or "That goes to the Minister of Housing" or "That goes to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics." Everyone passes the buck to someone else and what we end up having is no buck gets invested where it should for the long term. That is a detriment to the long-term benefit of the people of Ontario who want to own a home.

It takes a whole comprehensive program and idea to develop a concept of housing. It really means that the government starts with helping people financially. If they want to put money aside, then we can give them a tax benefit through an Ontario home ownership savings plan. That is certainly one of the vehicles that is used to help them. I encourage that, but we have not begun to go far enough, nor have we understood the differences and disparities that exist in the greater Toronto area, where the cost of property is twice as much as in the northern area. If it is not twice, it could be three times in some areas.

To get a starter home here costs well over \$200,000, and yet there are other opportunities within a few hundred miles of the greater Toronto area where you can buy a home for under \$100,000. We have the same program provided across the entire province, so what is good for the goose is good for the gander. What you get in Toronto is good for someone up north. That somehow does not take into the equation what it really costs to live in a house that you can afford and to have the costs covered. The program is not working.

The minister touts some figures. He says: "We've got a fantastic number of people. We've got 83,000 people who have

opened plans." How many of them are really going to be able to take advantage of it in buying a home, especially with the amount of money that is there? The government should get a whole comprehensive program together that takes into consideration all the ingredients in economical and affordable purchase housing. It was there back in the 1980s, to the credit of those who were leaders at the time.

I look to my friend the member for Simcoe West, who was in cabinet in those days when the investment was made for the York-Durham pipe. That was a significant cost outlay that said, "If we put this in, it is an upfront cost, but with it we will be able to build more housing." When that housing became available and people could hook into the sewer, then the price of property was low enough that people were able to buy a home, make that investment and put down their roots.

But there has been no advance, long-term planning by this government. What has it done to help open up more land for the future? The Seaton program is just an extension of things that were planned 15 and 20 years ago. The government must not come along and herald the day as if it did something significant or fantastic with Seaton. It is doing nothing to help the small guy right now.

This government was going to sell off some land it owned in Malvern, just a tremendous way of fuelling the cost of the price of housing and property in the greater Toronto area. I wish I had the exact figures in front of me, but it was not that long ago, three years ago, when this government had several lots that were left over in Malvern. They were no longer going to be used by the government in its own building program, so it put them up on the auction block. The auction block ended up paying the Minister of Housing an inflated amount per square foot for the land that was sold on that. What it did was peg a new, higher price for property values in the greater Toronto area because the government set a precedent in what it sold that land for. They set a precedent for a new high price for property that up until then had never been reached, and then all the undeveloped land that had not been sold was automatically escalated to the price of the land that they sold those lots for in Malvern.

I ask them to deny it. They will not deny it. It is a major contributor to the cost of housing in this province because the province itself ended up selling that land at inflated values and then all the land around went up accordingly.

What have they done? They have done bad in every way. They have taxed the limit out of people.

Mr J. B. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member is pointing his finger at this government and blaming it for the high price of the land sale.

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr J. B. Nixon: He should be aware that it was the federal Conservative government that controlled that sale.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Cousens: I do not know what he is talking about. I think that what he has done is just disrupt my train of thought, and I have to start from the beginning, and that is right back from scratch. The first thing that the Liberals like to do is blame the feds. I cannot believe how many times people have blamed those boys in Ottawa, and girls. Not just boys; there are girls up there who do it too. But I just cannot believe it.

Mr McCague: If they did anything, they would not have to blame anybody.

Mr Cousens: That is right. The government has a responsibility, and the provincial jurisdiction is very clear. They does not seem to understand it too often.

I thank you, Mr Speaker. I am sorry that I am distracted with the kinds of things that these Liberals do. It is very upsetting to me. I am speaking on behalf of the young couple, it could be my son or daughter, who in the not-too-distant future may want to settle down and have a home of their own.

Mr J. M. Johnson: Then you would have a conflict of interest.

Mr Cousens: I would have a conflict of interest if it were them. Well, I will keep fighting for them, and when I am fighting for them, it means I am going to fight for every young person in Ontario. The one thing about it is, they will be entrepreneurial enough that they will work hard and do their best. They are not going to expect the government to do much to help them, and I think my lesson to them is, "Don't expect this government to do anything for you, but if you work hard, study hard and work together, then you might end up with something."

The fact of the matter is, if they just wait for the government to help them with this Ontario home ownership savings plan, they will never own a home. They will have to get out there in the meantime and do what is right.

What I am saying here in my presentation is that this government is not doing what is right. They have done it wrong by overtaxation, and I gave the numbers a minute ago. They have done what is wrong in not planning new land to be developed and opened up. This government has not opened up new land. They have not made any significant investment. Would members tell me what investment they have made in providing for an infrastructure that is going to allow people to say, "Here is land that is going to be opened up and developed"?

I have not seen that initiative and it is not forthcoming. What we end up with is getting an \$11-million program, when in fact over a period of time, when you start looking at the billions of dollars that this government has taken out of our pockets—when we have gone from a \$15-billion total tax bill in Ontario in 1984-85 to \$34.9 million this year, you are talking more than double the income of the government, and then it goes and throws \$11 million into an ownership program to buy a home—not good, not good.

What we have to do is challenge this government to come out with programs that are really going to have a long-term impact, and that means putting together a comprehensive policy, getting the Minister of Housing involved with it, setting up a task force in which all members of the Legislature are involved in trying to address, respond to and resolve the concerns that are involved. The government should not just leave it to the Minister of Revenue to come in with a small, two-bit bill that is not going to do anything more to help a person buy a new home than just a small percentage of it.

Let's set the environment up so that we have a province in which every young person can hope to own his own home. That has to be what our goal should be as legislators. We want people to be able to have ownership in this country. In Eastern Europe we are beginning to see the opening up of ownership of property, and that is a sign that they are coming our way. What we are doing is going their way. We are drifting into a socialist state where this government is saying, "Well, we will look after other things." It cannot do it. It has to somehow make the investment in the long term, have a plan for the long term and

then act upon it. This government does not have a plan, it does not know how to act and it comes forward with a bill that does not begin to do much to help the Ontario new home buyer.

1730

I could go on further. I would just have to say that the concern I have is that everything this government has done has been to add to the cost of a home, not to reduce it. This program, if it is meant to reduce it, just does not come close. The land transfer tax, as I said earlier, increased by over \$1,000 in 1984-85. The lot levies, which will come in now under Bill 20, this new bill we have, are going to increase the cost of new property by up to \$10,000 a lot. That is going to ripple-effect through all the resale of other properties, and school boards are now going to benefit on it and towns will continue to have their own lot levy fees.

Lot levies are another way in which this government is saying, "Well, hey, look, we want to help cover costs in the local areas and so we will allow them to have their lot levy." But the fact of the matter is, that lot levy is going to make it even more difficult for a young person to buy a home, because on top of the regular cost of a house today, starting shortly, and already in some instances, a \$10,000 bill is added to it for school costs or for municipal costs or for other costs. It just does not make sense to me.

Then the Ontario provincial sales tax that the government brought in, taking it from 7% to 8%, has added \$2,000 to the cost of a new home, an extra \$2,000 since the present government came to power, an extra \$2,000 in purchasing a home. So it comes along and says, "Now we are going to have the Ontario new home savings plan. This is going to help you"—nothing close to the extra cost of a house.

It all adds up to the fact that this is a government that is great on the words but not great on the action. They are great in paying lipservice to people saying, "Oh, we are doing a wonderful job." Those of us who are watching the cost and seeing what is happening know that this government has failed. It has failed our young people who want to have the long-term benefit of ownership of their own property. I say that this government stands condemned for what it has failed to do and for the way it has done what it has done.

What do we do about it? I will fight them. I feel like a voice in the wilderness when I stand up and I make my points. It sounds as if the government is not going to listen. They are not going to increase the Ontario home ownership savings plan to \$4,000 per person. They are not going to allow young people to have 10 years to save for the program. They are only going to be allowed five years, so a maximum of five years' input into that program. Why not double it right away? If the minister has any power at all today in this House, he will come forward and say that he will make a commitment at least to discuss that with the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and the Premier, who has him on a very short string, so that he will be in a position to do something that is meaningful.

I am really disappointed. The government has a chance to come back in the House with a bill that is going to help home ownership. It has made minor changes, most of which I see as acceptable. It has come in with amendments which I am not really going to counter too much. I mean, they are trying to cover some of the holes in the system that they created, but I would say to them they should do what they really should do: deal with the urgent necessity, and that is, deal with the real primary need of young people, any people, people in Ontario who want to buy a home. Let's make the program meaningful

for them. It is not now; \$2,000 a year just is not enough. The government should double it so that they can really do something with it, and then, with the cost of inflation, the cost of property, the cost of interest rates, the cost of everything, they will have a chance of being able to buy their own place.

Why does the government not come out with some other programs as well? They have the chance to show leadership in that government and I am not seeing it. It is not coming forward. They should come out with some program. Why do we have to wait until the election is called to hear what the promises are? Then afterwards I sit around here and realize that they are broken, the broken promises of the guaranteed new homes that are going to be built that are never built. How many homes were going to be built by the end of last year and were not? How many hospital beds were going to be built—some extra 4,000 we were going to have—and were not? How many roads were going to be built and have not been? Come on.

I am just very disgusted that we are not dealing with the real substance of this bill, and that is the number of dollars that a person can put away towards buying a home. I hope the day will come when all the pages who are here will be able to own their own home and be able to buy it with their own savings.

If we have got a program at that time, maybe we will have a government in power by then that is doing things right and providing the balance that says: "There is an opportunity for free enterprise. We as a government will create an environment so that people will be able to invest in property, want to invest, and that would still be one of the best investments they ever have." The chance today of people being able to own their own home gets less and less and less, especially with the way this government is spending our money and not investing it properly.

One of the things that the minister said earlier—and I really take exception to the way in which he said that here we are wanting to reduce the cost of government. Yes, sir, I would reduce the cost of government and I would find ways of having the tax frozen right now as our leader, the member for Nipissing, has said. But there are things you do as a government to invest to make it a better community, and one of the things this government could do, when it has collected close to \$19 billion from the taxpayers of the province over five years, is put a little bit more than \$11 million into a home ownership savings program, and that is what we are talking about.

It is all relative, and here is a government that says it is doing a fine job. They have got to put some money back in there. They cannot just keep bleeding the people of Ontario, who will not take it any more. They have had it with taxation by the federal government and by the provincial government. This government keeps taking and taking and taking. When they throw it back, it is a peanut, and that is what half of the members are eating over there anyway. I notice all those members do around here is eat peanuts. It is peanuts this government is throwing to the province of Ontario, and the people deserve an awful lot more than what this government is doing.

Ms Bryden: I just want to say that I appreciate the member for Markham bringing out the history of the land tax increases over the past few years. They have been phenomenal, and this bill certainly does nothing to offset them or to offset the other taxes that have raised the price of homes throughout Ontario but particularly in Metropolitan Toronto. As a representative from that area, I think the minister should have brought in amendments that would have made this program accessible or available to people in Metropolitan Toronto.

At the moment the limits on income and on the price of houses just cuts the entire Metropolitan Toronto area out of any benefits from this very misguided bill anyway. But if we are going to have a bill, which I do not think we should have, we should make sure that Metropolitan Toronto residents have an opportunity to share in anything that is available under that bill, and I am very disappointed that the minister is going in the completely opposite direction from that. I would like to see the bill withdrawn.

Mr J. B. Nixon: I was listening to the member for Markham talk about his views on the housing market and the housing industry and the availability of affordable housing. He certainly does paint a black picture, but of course that black picture serves but one purpose, and that is his own party's interests at the next polls that may or may not take place.

People who are really seriously concerned about affordable housing know some of the measures that this Ministry of Housing has taken and this minister and previous ministers have taken to make available affordable housing: changing the planning process, making available government lands for affordable housing. The fruit can already be seen when you pick up the newspapers now and you start to see affordable housing listed at \$149,900, \$129,900, \$169,900.

There are more and more homes coming on the market at an affordable price, affordable for people in Metropolitan Toronto, on lands in and around Metropolitan Toronto. I think we are starting to see the success of a variety of programs, concerted efforts by the Ministry of Housing, by the private sector, finally dragging along some of the municipalities and indeed some of the more generous municipalities who have participated from the outset. All of them working together have produced affordable housing. The member will see more of it as it comes along. The picture is not as black as he would like to think it is.

1740

Mr Laughren: I would love to respond to the member who just spoke, but I know I must respond to the member who is speaking in the second reading debate. I know the member for Markham has a passion for ownership of everything, and I am wondering if he agrees with or supports subsections 1(3) and 1(4) of the bill that encourage the conversion of rental units to ownership units, given the shortage of rental accommodation in this province.

Mr Cousens: I would like to respond. I would like first of all to thank the member for Beaches-Woodbine for her remarks. I think that what you really need to have is that sense of what is going on in Metropolitan Toronto that she has in her riding and really understand the difficulty that people have in acquiring a home. It is obvious that the government has lost touch with what is going on there, and I really compliment her for that.

I find the member for York Mills humorous. I do not think he intends to be such a funny guy, but when he talks about my painting a black picture, I guess it is just that he does not like to see the truth in Technicolor. He would like to continue to walk around with rose-coloured glasses and pretend that everything is going fine. The electorate out there is beginning to see that this government is a do-nothing government, and that what it has done for housing is really nothing close to what the need really calls for. He says there are more homes—I guess there are condos. You have not seen any kind of—

Mr J. B. Nixon: No; single, detached.

Mr Cousens: He is saying single, detached homes.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr Cousens: I do not know if he is listening if I do not look at him, Mr Speaker. He is behind my back. How can I look at you and know—I mean, he could be going to sleep and I would not know it. That happens an awful lot around here, but certainly not with the member for York Mills.

More homes. I just do not believe it. I do not think he believes it.

Mr J. B. Nixon: I do.

Mr Cousens: That is the real nub of the matter. He stood up here and gave the party line. He came in from outside and he gave the three or four lines that someone gave him out in the lobby. The fact of the matter is, we just do not accept what he said. There has been no investment long-term to build the infrastructure for homes.

The member for Nickel Belt—I almost called him the member for rental units—I happen to agree with him. I really do not want to see us reduce or diminish the supply of rental accommodation and allow that to be an excuse to give people an incentive to buy up rental units when we are so short of them as it is. I think we should be doing everything we can within this province to increase rental accommodation as well.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. The member's time is up.

Mr Cousens: This government has not begun to respond to that need either. I think that is a subject for another day.

Hon Mr Mancini: During the short debate on the mining tax the member for Nickel Belt wanted to know why it had taken so long to bring certain pieces of legislation before the House. We have seen this afternoon why it takes so long. We have seen this afternoon where the bill which is before the House is very rarely mentioned.

We know that your patience is taxed to the extreme, Mr Speaker. We know that the bill before the House is rarely mentioned and members will use any excuse to repeat their reply to the throne speech or their reply to the budget speech that was probably given a year or two ago.

I have been told that my friend the member for Markham in a previous life served as a minister of the cloth. After I heard him speak today, I am sure that his collections on Sunday must have been outstanding because the member could inspire anyone on almost any subject, regardless of the facts. So I want to congratulate the member for his oratorical skills and I am sure that his sermons of many Sundays past are in fact legendary.

The members opposite basically are opposed to this bill. The Conservatives say that while they are opposed to it, they are going to vote for it anyway. The NDP members have said they are opposed to the bill and they are going to vote against it, thereby denying the many citizens of this province who can benefit from this assistance that opportunity. They make light of the statistics, they make light of the fact that thousands of people have been helped. I said earlier today that 83,000 had in fact been helped. Upon a review of the statistics, that figure was low. It was not 83,000; it was 91,261.

Of the 91,261 people who have used OHOSP up to 31 May 1990, 31,898 have bought their first homes. The members opposite make light of those figures and they speak here in this Legislature as if those 91,261 do not count. They speak here in this Legislature as if those 31,898 people who have used OHOSP to buy their first homes do not count, because the program is not as rich as they would like it. At the same time,

we hear from the member for Markham that he wants to hold down all government expenditures.

They make light of these people and they pretend that they do not count. The people who have used this program—

Mr Cousens: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member is misconstruing the things that I have been saying. Those people who have used it are probably not even going to be able to carry their mortgages now that they have bought a house. The fact—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. Minister.

Mr Cousens: When he said that I was not talking about the bill, then he—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Minister.

Hon Mr Mancini: I did not interrupt the sermon by the member for Markham. None of us did actually. None of us interrupted the sermon by the member for Markham. We are talking on the bill before the House.

The honourable members opposite, I believe, are surprised at the success of this program. I believe from some of the comments I heard today that maybe they wish it is not as successful as it is, when 31,898 people have been helped in purchasing their first homes. That is a significant number anywhere and a significant number here in Ontario, and that is before the enhancements to the bill that was put before the Legislature today. The enhancements that have been made will assist even more people in buying their first homes. This government is going to do that.

The enhancement which will allow spouses, or people who are just getting married or people who have just got married, which would remove the penalty from both spouses because one spouse happened to own a home, is fair and equitable and will help a lot of people.

The enhancement which will allow individuals to put their money in guaranteed investment certificates and receive a higher rate of interest than a regular account is going to help more people and will encourage more people to take advantage of the OHOSP program.

The enhancement which will allow people in the OHOSP program to withdraw funds and pay their contractor as work is being done will remove another penalty and will allow for the administration of the program to take place in a much simpler way, will allow the people who have a plan to do business in a much simpler way. The honourable members opposite know that.

In closing, I want to say that the honourable member for Markham spent most of his time actually talking about housing programs. Our government is proud of our Minister of Housing and we are proud of our housing initiatives. Under construction today, under construction this year, 17,000 units under the Homes Now program; \$3 billion to be made available for affordable housing over the next five years. That is more than the Conservative government had made available in their entire 44 years of office.

1750

Mr Laughren: Who's got the biggest limo?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Now can we proceed as per the standing orders?

Hon Mr Mancini: What can I say about my friend the member for Nickel Belt, who is infatuated with the car that is provided to me by the government of Ontario through the grateful taxpayers? What can I say to my colleague? I will say to my colleague the member for Nickel Belt that I am going to permanently reserve in my car a section for him.

Mr Cousens: The trunk.

Hon Mr Mancini: No, I will not reserve the trunk. I will permanently reserve in my car a section for the member for Nickel Belt. When I go back to my office late this evening, I am going to get a piece of Bristol board and write out, "Floyd Laughren, Nickel Belt. Reserved." I am going to put that in the vehicle and it will remain there and the member for Nickel Belt will never have to wet his shoes again. If it is raining, all he has to do is call over to the Ministry of Revenue and he will be afforded a ride in comfort and will be able to keep his shoes dry at all times.

But it is typical of the NDP members that they would rather not have anyone benefit from the OHOSP program. They would rather that these 91,000 people not benefit. They would rather not have had the 31,898 homes purchased with the assistance of OHOSP. They would rather have the bill cancelled, thrown out of the Legislature. They would rather have nothing at all because it does not meet their particular standards. My friend the member for Nickel Belt has been in the Legislature a long time.

Mr Cousens: Too long.

Hon Mr Mancini: The member for Markham has said, "Too long." The member for Nickel Belt knows the responsibility of government, and we in the Legislature are always involved in compromise and always involved in putting forward the best program at any given time. I would take this program, which has helped 31,898 people buy their first homes, any time over providing nothing. We are moving forward with this bill. We have the support of one opposition party, even though its members spoke for an hour against the bill. We are sad, but not surprised, that the NDP is not for this particular bill.

An hon member: They're never positive; they're always negative.

Hon Mr Mancini: They are always negative, as my colleagues have said here this afternoon.

In closing, we are proceeding. We believe the amendments are good, fair, and will help many, many Ontarians buy their first homes.

Mr Laughren: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—and I seek your assistance in determining which part of the standing orders; I confess I do not know—you will note that the title of Bill 105 reads An Act to amend the Ontario Home Ownership

Savings Plan Act, 1988. On page 9 of the bill, you will notice a complementary amendment in which this bill amends the Succession Law Reform Act. It seems to me, Mr Speaker, although I am no expert on these matters, that the very least that should happen is that the title of the bill should reflect the acts that it amends. Surely it is not up to the opposition to amend bills accordingly to make them comply with the standing orders of this place. I would ask you to rule, before this bill goes any further, as to whether or not it is appropriate to have this bill with the present title, considering the fact that it indeed amends another piece of legislation as well as the Ontario Home Ownership Savings Plan Act.

The Deputy Speaker: I have listened attentively and I have looked at the concerns that the member for Nickel Belt has. As I read again section 10, as it says, it is a complementary amendment. If it were not complementary I could understand the point more, but as it is a complementary amendment I am of the belief that these amendments can best be brought forward in the next committee, when this bill will be discussed further. Maybe at that point, in committee, you will be able to bring that point forward.

Mr Cousens: On a point of personal privilege, Mr Speaker: Because of the good relationship I have with the minister, I want to do this in the spirit of the repartee that goes on in the House. I really think, in clarification, the fact is that, yes, I did wear my collar backwards for a while. But I think he is almost insulting a true sermon when he says that what I am doing in here pertains to a sermon, because there are many preachers of the gospel and people of churches where a sermon is based properly on a context, a text of scripture, and it really has an awful lot of bearing that comes out of their biblical background, especially from the background I have. Therefore, to bring that kind of thing into the Legislature is not the place to do it. If in fact I might sound like a preacher sometimes, that is a different point.

Hon Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, my comments were in fact made completely in jest, because the honourable member and I have known each other for a good number of years. Any comments in reference to his previous occupation were done with good spirits. If anyone, including himself or anyone in the public who was watching, took offence to anything I said, I withdraw completely.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you both for a point of mutual explanation and respect.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

The House adjourned at 1757.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaitre, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Christine E.	York East	L	
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn.	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines, Minister of Culture and Communications

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: David R. Cooke, Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrundola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Floyd Laughren, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, James F. McGuigan, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Ruth A. Grier, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-chair: Lily Oddie Munro

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Shelley Martel, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: David E. Neumann

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Joan M. Fawcett, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Herbert A. Epp, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaitre, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray

Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Monday 4 June 1990

Members' statements

Health professions	1489
Mr Farnan	
Transportation	1489
Mr Cousens	
Passenger cruise ships	1489
Mr Keyes	
Funding for the hearing-impaired	1489
Mr Allen	
Chief Scout Awards	1490
Mr McLean	
Sanderson Centre for the Performing Arts	1490
Mr Neumann	
Eramosa play project	1490
Mr J. M. Johnson	
Senior citizens	1490
Mr Matrundola	
Italian National Day	1490
Mr Leone	
Mr Philip	
Mr Cousens	

Statements by the ministry

Ontario home ownership savings plan	1491
Mr Mancini	
Liquor licensing	1492
Mr Sorbara	

Responses

Ontario home ownership savings plan	1492
Mr Laughren	
Liquor licensing	1492
Mr Farnan	
Ontario home ownership savings plan	1493
Mr Brandt	
Liquor licensing	1493
Mr Sterling	

Oral questions

Pension reform	1497
Mr Morin-Strom	
Mr Elston	
Support and custody orders enforcement	1498
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Mrs Wilson	
Alcohol and drug treatment	1499
Mr Eves	
Mrs Caplan	
Chronic care	1499
Mr Eves	
Mrs Caplan	

Employment adjustment	1500
Mr Allen	
Mr Phillips	
Rail transportation	1501
Mr Cousens	
Mr Wrye	
Ontario Development Corp	1501
Mr M. C. Ray	
Mr Kwinter	
Health cards	1502
Mr Reville	
Mrs Caplan	
International trade	1503
Mr Tatham	
Mr Kwinter	
Timber management	1503
Mr Pouliot	
Mrs McLeod	
Education financing	1504
Mr Jackson	
Mr Conway	
Emergency shelter assistance program	1504
Mr D. R. Cooke	
Mr Beer	
Water quality	1505
Mrs Grier	
Mrs Caplan	

Report by committee

Standing committee on public accounts	1505
Mr Philip	
Adjourned	1505

First reading

Liquor License Act, 1990, Bill 175	1505
Mr Sorbara	
Agreed to	1505

Second readings

Business Names Act, 1989, Bill 108	1505
Mr Sorbara	1505
Mr Laughren	1505
Mr Farnan	1506
Ms Bryden	1506
Agreed to	1507
Easement Statute Law Amendment Act, 1989,	
Bill 106	1507
Mr Sorbara	1507
Mr Farnan	1507
Agreed to	1508
Mining Tax Amendment Act, 1989, Bill 104	1508
Mr Mancini	1508
Mr Laughren	1509
Mr Pollock	1509
Agreed to	1510

Ontario Home Ownership Savings Plan Amendment Act,

1989, Bill 105	1510
Mr Mancini	1510
Mr Laughren	1511
Mr Cousens	1511
Ms Bryden	1518
Mr J. B. Nixon	1518
Agreed to	1518

Other business

Resignation of member for Scarborough West	1493
Mr R. F. Johnston	
Mr Laughren	
Mr Jackson	
Mr Conway	
Adjournment	1520

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1521
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1524

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le lundi 4 juin 1990

Déclaration ministérielle

Permis de vente d'alcool	1492
M. Sorbara	

Divers

Démission du député de Scarborough-ouest	1493
M. R. F. Johnston	

Première lecture

Loi de 1990 sur les permis de vente d'alcool,	
projet de loi 175	1505
M. Sorbara	
Adoptée	1505



41 1990

41 1990

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 5 June 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 34^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 5 juin 1990



Speaker
Honourable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Hugh A. Edighoffer

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 5 June 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

NORTHERN COMMUNITIES

Mr Laughren: I am increasingly concerned about the attitude of this Liberal government towards small, remote communities in northern Ontario. This government gets so wrapped up in problems with the large urban centres in the south that our Ontario citizens in small, remote communities are completely forgotten.

In these communities, and I have several in my constituency of Nickel Belt—communities such as Biscotasi, Sultan, Westree, Shining Tree, Pineal Lake and Renabie—there often are no schools, no basic health services, no bus service and only very unreliable rail transportation. Road connections, often by logging roads, are usually in terrible condition, certainly worse than concession roads in southern Ontario.

For example, a road that links Highway 129 to Sultan, just south of Chapleau, is in such bad shape that several accidents have occurred recently because drivers lost control of their vehicles after hitting a pothole. A school bus travels over this same road every day.

As the past president of the Northeastern Ontario Chambers of Commerce, Gilbert Riou, wrote recently, and I quote, "No wonder only a few tourists dare venture into northern Ontario, and their number is decreasing every year."

The Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Northern Development know about these problems and still they remain. No community in the south would put up with these conditions for a day, let alone for months, nor should it have to.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Mrs Marland: Today, 5 June, is World Environment Day, and 3 June to 9 June is National Environment Week. In Canada, public concern over the environment is more widespread than ever before. Whether it is introducing recycling programs, planting trees or lobbying for stricter pollution controls, Canadians are getting involved.

A recent Gallup poll showed that 85% of the population thinks governments are not doing enough to clean up the environment. That result should have every member of this Legislature thinking about the progress we have and have not made to protect our environment.

We can be proud of our expanding blue box programs as well as the agreement reached by all of Canada's environment ministers to cut packaging in half by the end of the decade, but we do not have a solution for the hundreds of communities that are running out of places to put their garbage. Air pollution is another area where we have seen significant progress but not enough. The Countdown Acid Rain program is reducing harmful emissions from the four largest industrial sources of acid gases, yet we badly need a replacement to our outdated regulation 308 so other air polluters will be required to clean up their emissions.

To mark World Environment Day, let's work harder at all levels, from the household and community to the United Na-

tions, to solve our pressing environmental problems. Future generations around the world are counting on us. This is a magnificent planet. Let us ensure its future by our actions to preserve it.

INVITATION TO KINGSTON

Mr South: This is an invitation to all members of the Legislature and their staff to join us in welcoming the Honourable Joe Ghiz from the cradle of civilization to where the Confederation dream began, in Kingston, tomorrow night. Come on down, enjoy eastern Ontario hospitality at that fabulous city at the eastern end of Lake Ontario called Kingston.

Mr Jackson: This is not a Liberal fund-raiser, is it?

Mr South: No, nothing like that; no.

FERTILIZER PLANT FEASIBILITY STUDY

Miss Martel: Six months have passed since I last raised the matter of a fertilizer plant in northern Ontario. There has been no word from the government on the proposal since then. The history of the fertilizer plant is a sordid one indeed.

The Ministry of Northern Development and Mines announced a study of the project in March 1986. The idea was to combine excess sulphuric acid produced in the smelting process with phosphate deposits found in Cargill township to produce fertilizer. Sudbury was supposed to be included in that initial study, but for some reason it was not.

Then in March 1989, after a great deal of prodding from the United Steelworkers, Sudbury regional council, the Sudbury Development Corp and myself and my colleague the member for Nickel Belt, the Liberals agreed to fund phase 2 of the study. This was to involve other government ministries and private industry. We were assured that Sudbury would now be included and examined as a potential site for such a plant.

In June 1989 the owners of the phosphate property decided to do their own study on the value of bringing a mine into production. The government decided to stop its work until the results of the Sherritt Gordon/Newphos review were known. This is where the project has sat since June of last year.

The fertilizer plant is important for Sudbury in both economic and environmental terms. I wish the government were as committed to it as we are, but it is obvious that we are going to wait a long, long time for this project to get off the ground, if it ever does.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Mr Jackson: It is with great pleasure that I inform all members of the House that earlier this year Burlington became the first city in the greater Toronto area to have declared itself a sustainable development community. In so doing, Burlington city council imposed on itself an environmental perspective on all city activities and services, from planning to purchasing. This program, among other things, will investigate the costs of programs and development, bringing the true cost of resources on to the balance sheets in order to help bring environment and economy into harmony.

In what is being widely heralded as a watershed change for municipal governments in the 1990s, this declaration will en-

sure that all Burlington city actions, including the official plan, will be scrutinized for their environmental implications. From now on, development that is compatible with sustainable resource use and environmental preservation and protection will be emphasized and actively promoted.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate and commend all members of Burlington city council for addressing the important challenge to find new forms of development that are sustainable and environmentally sensitive and for taking their stand against development that is not. I also commend Burlington council on its decided leadership in environmental initiatives, especially at a time when Ontario is experiencing an environmental leadership vacuum from this Liberal government.

On this World Environment Day, may all Ontario municipalities begin to follow the example and the achievements of Burlington city council in integrating environmental protection with planning for economic and physical development.

1340

LANDLORDS' RESTRICTIONS ON PETS

Mr Faubert: In October 1989, in a private member's statement, I called on the Attorney General to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act to protect responsible tenant pet owners. Shortly thereafter the Attorney General pointed out that it would be prudent to first find out if the Fluffy the cat, or Cassandra v Rhyl case would be used as a precedent in the courts.

Members will be aware that last Friday, 1 June, an Ontario district court judge ordered three Toronto tenants to get rid of their cats or vacate their homes. Tenant pet owners in my riding are now concerned that even though their pets are no trouble to other tenants, they may also be forced to vacate or give up their pets. As a result of these Ontario district court decisions, it became apparent there was a need to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act to ensure that pet owners would only face eviction if their pets were deemed to be a hazard or a nuisance to other tenants.

In many households, pets are considered to be members of the family. They are often a comfort to all family members, in particular seniors, as they can provide a sense of security, protection, companionship and affection. Thus, I was pleased to be advised that the Attorney General has announced he will indeed be amending the Landlord and Tenant Act to protect tenants with well-behaved pets, and I encourage him to introduce these amendments at the earliest possible opportunity.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr Mackenzie: Last Saturday morning I joined a dedicated band of environmentalists and members of the Save the Valley committee, led by John Ellis, to walk the Red Hill Creek valley from King Street to Queenston Road in the city of Hamilton, while there is still a forest there. Less than two minutes into the walk, you would not know you were in the city of Hamilton. This is a strange, beautiful wilderness where we were serenaded by large numbers of birds and viewed wonderful trees and wildflowers that overwhelmed the senses.

At the start of the walk, at King Street and Mount Albion, the Rosedale Bowl, the pending destruction of the valley is already obvious. Chainsaws and bulldozers have already laid waste to huge trees and bush area and the naked devastation awaits the ugly concrete of the expressway. How in God's name the destruction of this beautiful green belt can be equated with

progress that might mean shoehorning a few more cars into a city centre maybe five minutes quicker is totally beyond me.

The hypocrisy of Canadians complaining about the destruction of the healthy lungs of the world population by destroying the Brazilian rain forest is starkly outlined as we blithely destroy the lungs of our own population by building this expressway.

I consider what is happening in the east end of Hamilton a tragedy that denies understanding of our country and our children's environmental future. I cannot understand local politicians, once opposed to the valley's destruction and now in positions of power, idly standing by subservient to developers' priorities.

I suspect that the next generation will damn the shortsighted politicians, developers and governments that allowed this destructive obscenity. When will we come to our senses, and will it be in time?

ZEBRA MUSSELS

Mr Villeneuve: I would like to give the House an update on the Progressive Conservative Party caucus information campaign to tell municipalities, anglers, cottagers and boaters about the problem with zebra mussels.

On 18 May, just before Victoria Day weekend, we launched a public relations campaign with the distribution of over 10,000 information brochures warning outdoor enthusiasts of the dangers of the creature, which is rapidly infesting Ontario's waterways. This pamphlet was sent to marinas, cottages, municipalities and conservation authorities right across the province and outlines steps to be taken on how to slow the spread of the mussels.

We are happy to see that Ontarians are willing to do their bit to control this very dreaded pest. In two weeks since the campaign was launched, we have been swamped with requests for over 1,000 of these brochures. Of very special interest is a request from the Ministry of Natural Resources. I must say this is indeed a compliment, and I would like to send copies of this pamphlet over to the minister herself and to her parliamentary assistant.

Just last week in estimates, the minister said her staff would be embarking on a campaign to tell municipalities, anglers, cottagers and boaters about the zebra mussel problem. I expect ministry staff think this brochure is worth copying. Therefore, it is a pleasure for me to send copies of this brochure to the parliamentary assistant and to the Minister of Natural Resources.

WATER SAFETY

Mr Owen: Recently the Royal Life Saving Society's Ontario branch began its 1990 Water Smart drowning prevention campaign. This campaign is of particular interest in Simcoe county, where we have year-round recreational use of our surrounding lakes and rivers.

Figures provided by the society showed that 252 accidental drownings happened in Ontario in 1988, up from 226 in 1987. This was the highest rate of drowning in Canada, where more than 1,200 people drown every year. The majority of drownings occurred in open water, in lakes and rivers, with less than 10% in swimming pools.

Some other statistics are frightening: 97% of drowning victims were not wearing lifejackets; more than 40% of boating fatalities involve alcohol; men accounted for 82% of water-related fatalities in 1987, due in part to men taking more risk, not

wearing life vests or by consuming alcohol before entering the water.

The tragedy of many drownings is that with a little common sense they would be preventable. The Royal Life Saving Society and its partners, the OPP, the Brewers of Ontario, Nasion Canada marine division, and Mustang Industries Inc, along with support from the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, have targeted their campaign to reach those most at risk. They hope that young men, particularly boaters and anglers, will take note of the water safety message. A successful campaign in 1990 should lead to declining accident statistics in the years to come.

ORAL QUESTIONS

JOB SECURITY

Mr D. S. Cooke: I have a question of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. The minister will be very much aware of the agreements that were made by his government and the federal government with Varsity Corp. A \$200-million bailout package in the early 1980s guaranteed that 1,000 jobs would be maintained in Canada until 1989 and from that point forward 1,500 jobs would be maintained. The penalties provided were \$30,000 for each job that was either not maintained or achieved up to the 1,500. Now we have this company that, in addition to not achieving its job creation guarantees and targets, is also likely to be moving its headquarters out of Ontario and out of Canada. What is the government doing to maintain the integrity of this company and the jobs and head office in Ontario?

Hon Mr Kwinter: The member is correct in saying that we had entered into an agreement with Varsity. They have given us certain undertakings and we expect that they will honour them. We have been in ongoing negotiations with them in order to settle disputes or settlements on those workers who have been laid off to make sure that they get a fair and equitable severance. Although there has been speculation in the media about their moving to a location in northern New York, we have no confirmation of that, but we fully expect that we will enforce all the requirements and undertakings in our agreement.

Mr D. S. Cooke: The agreement the minister signed with Varsity did not talk about negotiating severance packages for people who lose their jobs. The agreement said that the jobs were to remain in place, and if those jobs did not remain in place, there were supposed to be \$30,000-per-job penalties.

Number one, is the minister going to enforce that section of the agreement? Number two, is he aware of the announcement that was made just last Friday in Windsor by Kelsey-Hayes, which is owned by Varsity, that the 240 jobs that exist in that facility in Windsor will no longer exist as of 24 August; they will be indefinitely suspended? The company says it is not a plant closure; all the jobs will just be eliminated indefinitely. What is the minister doing to protect those 240 jobs in Windsor?

Hon Mr Kwinter: We are doing our utmost to protect a number of jobs, but we cannot guarantee protection of specific jobs. If a market disappears for a specific product, we cannot say to them, "Notwithstanding that you can't sell that product, you must continue to manufacture it." We have a commitment from Varsity regarding the people who work there, and we will enforce that, but if a market disappears, we are going to have to work with an adjustment; we are going to have to work with them, as we are, with their obligations under their pension

plans. These are all part of ongoing negotiations that we are carrying on with Varsity. As I said before, we expect that Varsity will honour all its commitments under that agreement.

1350

Mr D. S. Cooke: The minister can expect that they are going to live up to the agreement, but they know the kind of people they are dealing with, and the government is not going to enforce the agreement. That is the message that is coming from the minister and from the federal government.

The minister went to Windsor a few weeks ago to announce 138 jobs to be created three years from now, but he is willing to do absolutely nothing to protect 240 jobs that exist now. If he is not prepared to enforce that agreement, when is his government going to come through with the promises that the Liberals made in the past to have decent and universal severance pay for people who lose their jobs, adequate notice for plant closures and a process of public justification so that companies like Varsity, which made \$92 million at the end of January of this year, cannot just rip off the workers, eliminate jobs and leave communities hanging as they are doing right now?

Hon Mr Kwinter: I really take exception to the member's statements, because he made exactly the same statement when Ford Motor Co announced it was going to close down its engine plant. He wanted to know what we were going to do. We have shown him what we are going to do. We have Ford building a \$60-million metal casting plant. That is just a start, and the member knows it.

In the meantime, we have been working to make sure those commitments will be honoured.

All the things the member says are taken out of context. He has to understand that we are in a market that is under severe pressure—he knows that—because of global economies, interest rates and free trade. We are going to have to take care of that adjustment. I will tell the member that with Kelsey-Hayes we have a situation where the market has changed and the wheels that are manufactured there do not have the same marketability as they did. We are going to have to make sure that there is a proper adjustment. That is being taken care of. I want to reiterate what I said before: We expect that Varsity will honour its commitments.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr Philip: I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can the minister inform the House whether or not he believes it is appropriate for crown corporations and agencies under his ministry to make contributions to partisan political campaigns?

Hon Mr Black: No, I do not.

Mr Philip: Then the minister will no doubt be familiar with Ottawa Mayor Jim Durrell. After all, he is running for the presidency of the federal Liberal Party.

An hon member: He was.

Mr Philip: He was. The minister will also know that Mr Durrell has some difficulties concerning fund-raising for his election campaign. Money collected was not reported, donations in excess of the legal limits were falsely reported, thousands of dollars were put into the mayor's personal bank account and the largest contributor was the Ottawa Congress Centre, which is under his jurisdiction and contributed \$3,000, or six times the legal limit. Does the minister feel that this is justifiable for a crown agency under his jurisdiction?

Hon Mr Black: As the member will know, the whole question of contributions to the campaign of the mayor of Ottawa is under investigation by the OPP. It would not be appropriate for me to comment on that particular aspect of the question.

However, I do want to make very clear that I do not support the concept, the idea or the practice of crown corporations, agencies of my ministry, making any kind of political donations. I conveyed that information to the chairman of the board over a week ago. The member will be pleased to know that since that time the chairman of the Ottawa Congress Centre and his board of directors have decided that practice will not be continued.

Mr Philip: Now that the money is lost, would the minister tell us what specific intentions he has of removing those people whom his government appointed to that board and who allowed and even condoned publicly, for "public relations," the donation to this partisan Liberal campaign for mayor, and what steps he intends to take to recover the money that was given from the Ottawa Congress Centre to this partisan political campaign?

Hon Mr Black: Let me first of all make it very clear that the Ottawa Congress Centre and its affairs are directed by a very competent management team and board of directors who represent the community of Ottawa and whose membership, including its chairman, are people who are held in high regard by people across this province. I want to make it very clear that I am fully supportive of the Ottawa Congress Centre management and the board of directors. They are an excellent group of people who spend hours of their time working on behalf of the people of Ontario, and I resist any attempt to discredit them by any member of the opposition.

Having said that, let me also repeat once again that the practice of purchasing tables or tickets for fund-raising events held in the congress centre was done by the group as an attempt to market the congress centre, and I have no fault to find with that except when it involves political parties. Once again, I have made my position very clear. I have expressed to the chairman of the board my belief, my very firm belief, that this practice should not be continued.

HOMES FOR THE AGED

Mr Harris: I have a question of the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs. I am sure the minister is aware that homes for the aged run by Metropolitan Toronto have indicated they will have to stop admitting individuals and they will have to disallow residents to return after hospital stays if the province does not increase their funding. I would like to ask the minister how, if at all, he plans to respond to this problem.

Hon Mr Morin: I would like to refer this question to my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Hon Mr Beer: The leader of the third party knows it is our ministry which funds the homes for the aged, and I would want to make very clear at the outset that we have not received any communication from Metro Toronto regarding its budget for 1990. In point of fact, there is a process of dealing with budgetary matters and it would be very much on the front of our agenda list to ensure that any senior in Metro who needed this kind of care would be able to receive it. We will be working closely with Metro to look at its budget when it is presented to see what problems there are and what kinds of steps we can take with Metro to ensure that this situation does not arise.

The honourable member would want to know that over the last four years we have increased our funding to Metro by some 40%, from slightly over \$48 million to just under \$68 million, so that in fact we can have the services and the beds for those seniors who need them.

Mr Harris: Since the minister responsible for senior citizens cannot give us any assurance at all that this will not occur and that seniors will be able to find facilities, I would like, aside from all the baffle gab that the Minister of Community and Social Services has given us, to try to get that assurance from him.

Clearly, they have indicated that because of a lack of resources homes for the aged will be forced now to send residents to chronic care facilities. The minister should be aware, if that is their only alternative, this is impossible. In Metro Toronto there are now 3,000 people on the waiting list for chronic care beds, so all they are going to do is send them to a waiting list.

I tell the minister, we in the Progressive Conservative Party are extremely concerned about this government's failings in providing adequate services for the sick and the elderly. Can the minister guarantee that each and every person who will be turned away by a home for the aged will not be left either in a very expensive acute care facility or at home on his own without proper care?

Hon Mr Beer: It is indeed ironic that the leader of the third party, whose friends in Ottawa very nicely made a mockery of the health budget by cutting funds that come to the provinces, and made a mockery of the Canada assistance plan, which helps seniors, among others, should get up on his high horse in taking a newspaper article about a budget that has not been presented to us, where we have had no occasion to sit down with Metropolitan Toronto to continue to work with it to ensure in fact that seniors in Metro, as well as those throughout the province, have the kind of extended care beds available that they need.

The member would want to know that during this past year we have been opening and shortly will be opening further beds so that seniors will in fact have that capacity. As the honourable member knows as well, we are also, through the long-term care, making changes to the system which are going to provide help to seniors who do not have to be in facilities. I think once we have had the opportunity of sitting down with Metro, the member will see that in fact the needs of those seniors who need those beds will be met.

1400

Mr Harris: I would suggest that this minister and this government, who have cut off funding for food banks, are in no position to criticize any other level of government or any other person for cutting back on funding. The minister said his funding is up 40% since he took office. Inflation is up 50% during that period of time, in this area of costing where they are. Further, we have more sick and elderly needing spaces.

The sad truth is that neither the minister nor the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs can guarantee not only how we are going to take care of the 3,000 individuals in Toronto on the waiting list, but the situation is deteriorating and getting worse each and every day, in spite of the fact his tax revenues, over this period of time that he has been in government, are up over 100%. So he should not talk to me about 40% for the sick and elderly when that problem is getting worse and his revenues are up over 100%.

Given all the money that he has had, given his neglect of this problem and given that the situation is getting worse, what specific plan does he have to make sure that the sick and the elderly are not paying the price for his inaction?

Hon Mr Beer: Speaking of bafflegab, that question probably had more bafflegab in it than any other that has been presented to date.

The honourable member knows full well that we have been putting funding into this area. Not only have we gone up 40% in terms of funding for homes for the aged, but the amount of money that we have been increasing for services in the community and at home has been going up at a rapid rate as well. The honourable member some days gets up and criticizes the government for the increase in the revenues that we have, then on the other hand will get up and say we should not be spending that money. He cannot have it both ways. The problem with the third party is that it wants to have it both ways.

This government has made a commitment that we will provide the appropriate services for seniors through the long-term care initiative, and we have, over the last four and five years, been putting funding directly into this area. The needs of the seniors in Metropolitan Toronto, as in Nipissing, as in other parts of the province, will be met because we are putting the policies in place that are going to meet those needs.

Mr Harris: The minister can shout all he wants, but it is unbecoming for a minister with his record to be self-righteous.

The Speaker: Order. New question.

HEALTH CARDS

Mr Harris: I would like to ask the Minister of Health how much money the new computer system in Kingston, the new plastic cards that she is issuing for OHIP premiums, the massive number of advertisements that have gone across on radio, on television, in newspapers, to whatever extent that she has done there, the mailouts, all-inclusive, is costing the Ministry of Health, ie, the taxpayers of this province.

Hon Mrs Caplan: The total budget for the Ministry of Health this year is \$15.3 billion. The new card component of the overall redevelopment of the OHIP system is about \$30 million. We consider that an important investment for the future.

Mr Harris: The minister mentions the overall budget, some \$15 billion, up from some \$9.5 billion since the government took office. I mention that for the government because it is a party that measures success in terms of how many dollars it spends, not in terms of results.

The auditor's report talked about the 25 million OHIP numbers that were registered and the outdatedness and the lack of accountability that this provided in the \$15-billion budget that the Ministry of Health comes forward with. The purpose for this whole program, the only stated purpose she brought, is to bring in accountability.

Hon Mrs Caplan: It's not true.

Mr Harris: The minister says that is not true. Maybe she just wanted to spend \$30 million and get a nice letter out from herself before an election and make a contact with everybody.

The Speaker: And the question might be?

Mr Harris: I assume it was to put accountability into the system.

Interjection.

Mr Harris: Now the minister says that is it. I thank her. If the purpose is to put accountability into the system and into how this \$15 billion is going to be spent, how can the minister, given the information we have that anybody can get a card, any individual can get five or six cards, any American can get a card—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mr Harris: —any person from Quebec can get a card, anybody from Manitoba can get a card, because surely if a cat and dog can get a card, anybody can get one and anybody can get any number—

The Speaker: Minister.

Hon Mrs Caplan: In fact, I am very pleased that the leader of the third party has asked this question, because it allows me once again to restate how important is not only the new numbering system but the opportunity for enhanced accountability, better planning and better managing of the overall health system.

In his preamble he stated that the cost of the system has significantly increased. The fact is that when this government took office in 1984-85, the budget of the Ministry of Health was \$8.3 billion; this year it is \$15.3 billion, fully a \$7-billion increase over that period of time. The additional assistance that the new numbering system will permit, I think, will be substantial, and it is estimated that over the next 10 years it will result in savings of some \$150 million.

I would say to him that as we move forward with implementing the new numbering system, it was determined that there would be some pre-registration controls, and one was that only those people who presently have an OHIP number were eligible to apply. There are in place today post-numbering controls and audits and so forth, and I am pleased to have an opportunity in this House to reassure people that this is an important component of the new system.

Mr Harris: Credit cards are issued for \$3, \$4, \$5 a card with accountability. Drivers' licences are issued with accountability. I do not think anybody would say it is easy for somebody to get two drivers' licences. I do not think they would say it is easy for anybody to get two or three social insurance numbers without that being cross-referenced.

The minister reaffirmed in her answer that she measures success in terms of the amount of dollars spent. Clearly, throwing money willy-nilly into the health care system has not solved the problem. The waiting lists are longer. We have more people waiting for beds. The waiting lists for surgery are longer. The Provincial Auditor, I believe, was on the right track.

The Speaker: The question?

Mr Harris: We must put accountability into the system.

I am writing to the auditor today suggesting that he put a halt to this nonsense program until the minister can satisfy the auditor and the standing committee on public accounts that in any sense, in any way—and I would ask her to reassure me today—

The Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Actually, this is question period; it is not debate time. Minister.

Hon Mrs Caplan: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

I think it is extremely important for everyone to realize that as part of the new numbering system we wanted to ensure that

people receive their new cards as quickly as possible so that they would not have to worry about continuum of care. That is happening. We are receiving some four million new applications from 9.5 million people, and to the leader of the third party, who would bring Americanized health care to Ontario, I would say to him, he is on the wrong track.

1410

WASTE DISPOSAL DÉPÔTS DES DÉCHETS

Mr Morin-Strom: I have a question for the Minister of Northern Development. The minister is aware that a number of southern Ontario communities, most particularly in the area of Metro Toronto, are interested in turning northern Ontario into a dump site for southern Ontario garbage. Will the minister tell us whether he is willing to see the north turned into a wasteland for southern Ontario or will he take a position that the movement of garbage to the north is an unacceptable way of dealing with the garbage crisis being faced in many communities in Ontario?

Hon Mr Fontaine: This question was asked of me last year and I am going to answer the same way, that for myself I think it is a local issue for the municipalities that are interested to look into that venture. Myself, at this point, I have nothing to say about it. I will wait until all the reports are in and see what the implications of that kind of project are. That is my answer today.

Mr Morin-Strom: Surely this is an issue that the Minister of Northern Development should be showing some leadership from the north on.

We know that there is a very real threat when, for example, Ontario Northland Railway is proposing to haul garbage from the greater Toronto area by rail to landfills or to incineration plants that it would like to see constructed in either Kapuskasing, New Liskeard or Kirkland Lake.

The people of northern Ontario do not want to be turned into a dump site for the south. Surely southerners have to deal with their own problem and cannot be allowed to hide it in rural and northern Ontario.

Will this minister stand up for the north and say that the south has to solve its own problems? We will solve our problems in the north, but surely this kind of transportation of garbage around the province, hiding it in northern Ontario, turning the north into a wasteland, is not what northerners want to see of our pristine wilderness areas.

Hon Mr Fontaine: Again, listening to the member for Sault Ste Marie, first, I want to remind him that there will not be any dump site in the north without going through all those environmental assessments, and the people in northern Ontario at that time—is it EAs or what?

Mrs Marland: EPA. It is not under the environmental assessment act.

L'hon. M. Fontaine : Ça ne me concerne pas. Je ne comprends plus rien. I do not understand English too much. So—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Fontaine: I know there was a guarantee here from the Minister of the Environment that—

Interjections.

L'hon. M. Fontaine : Je vais parler en français parce que je ne veux pas me faire interrompre par la députée de Mississauga, je ne sais pas de quelle place, Mississauga West or Mississauga East, I do not know, but still, I want to tell her something.

Mr Brandt: South.

L'hon. M. Fontaine : Le ministre de l'Environnement, l'année passée, à ce temps-ci — c'était une question, je crois, du chef du troisième parti, du député de Nipissing. Il a posé une question sur cette même chose. Je dois répéter aux gens du nord de l'Ontario que, lorsque les décisions seront prises, nous allons avoir des études qui seront faites.

Ensuite, il y aura des assemblées publiques pour étudier ce projet. À ce moment-là, il y aura une décision qui sera prise par le gouvernement, à savoir si c'est bon quant à la santé ou si les gens n'en veulent pas. Alors, les gens du nord, à ce moment-là, décideront sur ce sujet.

SUPPORT SERVICES FOR STUDENTS

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Minister of Education.

M. Kerrio : En français.

Mr Jackson: I would like to try that.

The minister would be aware of the dramatic increase in reported cases of violence and behavioural problems in our schools involving school-age children, as well as in society in general and that this is now reaching somewhat crisis proportions in this province.

The minister would be aware that the Durham Board of Education, in a letter to him, has expressed specific concern that the board feels that there are over 5,000 students who need the assistance of several government ministries in order to deal with their problems. These are behavioural, emotional, social. These are substance abuse problems. There is a whole series of problems, but they feel that they can deal with only about 800 to 850 cases.

My question to the minister is, in spite of this problem reaching crisis proportions, can he tell this House what specifically he and his ministry are doing in order to address this crisis in Ontario schools?

Hon Mr Conway: I thank my honourable friend for his question. It repeats a question that his colleague the member for London North raised a few days ago and I would want to provide him with some of the same information.

I can certainly appreciate that as the stresses within society increase, there is, to be sure, within the school community, some of what the honourable member has described. He puts a more critical or negative cast on the situation than I think the facts would suggest. I would remind him that just a few weeks ago I was in the home city of his illustrious leader, and in that community I saw a number of very good examples where the school boards were working in partnership with a number of other care givers to address a number of the social and related pressures that the member's question takes account of.

I can tell him that in a very unfortunate situation in Burlington a few months ago, at General Brock High School, we saw how the staff of that school, particularly the principal and a number of teachers, acted with very, very great aplomb under a great deal of pressure. We must all, whether we are in this Legislature or in the school community, do what we can to ensure that there is the highest level of service in these and other areas of community need.

Mr Jackson: The minister's pride in an emergency response team is not the issue here. We should not have to have emergency response teams mopping up in our schools in this province. If the minister thinks I am putting a negative tone on some of these activities, in my jurisdiction alone we have three students up on murder charges. I have three students who were shot by a 17-year-old. Three weeks ago we had a girl who committed suicide because she could not get the support services, she could not get access to a bed. Now we have a girl who was put in the hospital in the last 24 hours because of her third attempt at suicide. Today, if you ask for a bed in Halton region for a school-aged child, they have to send the child to Toronto.

The truth is, we have a crisis in this province and the minister is not addressing it. I will be alarmist if I have to be in order to get the minister's attention.

The Speaker: Question?

Mr Jackson: Again, what specifically is the minister doing to help the teachers and the support staff and the principals to deal with these cases of children, whose only form of reaction is to commit suicide because they are frustrated and they have nowhere to turn? What is the minister doing about it?

Hon Mr Conway: I do not think anyone in this House would dispute the fact that the honourable member for Burlington South is prepared to be alarmist to get attention. I must say that I do not share the view that he has brought to this question, sensitive though it is. I think there is all kinds of evidence across the province that schools and other care givers in the community, with the support of various departments of the government of Ontario, including the ministry, have undertaken a number of very positive and creative initiatives that, to the very best of our ability, address these and related needs.

I remind my honourable friend that on a daily basis some two million people go to elementary and secondary schools across this province. If he is saying that we can do more, I would agree, and I am very anxious, in a constructive and positive way, to work with the school community and others to ensure that a number of the stresses and strains to which the question makes reference are anticipated and reasonably and positively dealt with.

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr Adams: My question is for the Minister of Government Services. In the budget it was mentioned that the Minister of Government Services would be making announcements soon about the decentralization of government positions. We know that there has been very successful decentralization to northern Ontario, and it is my hope that consideration will be given to decentralization to eastern Ontario. My question of the minister is, when can we expect these decentralization announcements?

Hon Mr Ward: The member is quite correct in pointing out that decentralization of government agencies is an ongoing initiative of this government as enunciated in the budget. Most recently, he will know that the ministry, in conjunction with the Ministry of the Solicitor General, concluded after many years of study a very successful relocation of the OPP from four sites near the lakeshore to Orillia, thus moving over 700 jobs to that community, bringing with it a \$35-million annual payroll.

There is no question that over the course of the past several years, we have had significant success in the northern Ontario relocation program. That is a model that we intend to follow,

and over the course of the next few months we will be making determinations as to potential other moves as we continue to bring the government of this province closer to the people and ensure that all communities share in those economic benefits.

1420

Mr Adams: I am a great supporter of the decentralization program in principle and in practice. As you know, Mr Speaker, my riding of Peterborough is in eastern Ontario. In fact, it is in the western limit of eastern Ontario. It is kind of a gateway to eastern Ontario, and I would like to ask the minister by way of supplementary whether Peterborough riding in particular is being considered for the relocation of ministry positions.

Hon Mr Ward: There is no question that Peterborough, as a thriving city in this province, certainly has its many merits. We take into account a broad variety of factors in making determinations. We will be looking at the ratio of government jobs as a percentage of the existing workforce. We will look at the availability of a pool of human resources.

Certainly Peterborough, obviously with Trent University and the human resources infrastructure that exists there, would be a prime candidate. We are also looking at the impact that such relocations could have as an economic development catalyst to a region. In short, I would say that Peterborough definitely has many merits and will be very carefully considered in making those decisions in the future.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr Charlton: I have a question for the Minister of Energy on a matter which I have raised with her on a number of occasions, and so too have many others.

For the first time, this week we had an admission by Alan Holt, Hydro's vice-president for corporate planning, that Hydro is concerned about the declining operation of its nuclear plants. The average operation of the 16 reactors now in operation in Ontario has dropped to 77%. All of those reactors under 10 years of age are still operating at 90%; all of those over 10 years of age are operating at 57% or less and declining rapidly. Hydro would lead us to believe that all of the problems we had last summer and last winter result from growth in demand, when in fact the reactor performance plays a major role in cutting the line.

Will the minister tell the House when she is going to step in and intervene, both in Hydro's current operations and in its planning process, to ensure that 10 or 12 years down the road we are not backed into a corner that leaves this province in blackouts and brownouts—

The Speaker: Thank you. Order. The question was asked.

Hon Mrs McLeod: I am not sure in my response to the initial question whether to deal with the first part of the question, which is an acknowledged concern on the part of Ontario Hydro about some problems that it has encountered in the nuclear generating stations, both with pressure tubes and also with buildup in the steam generating units, which have involved cleanouts and which indeed have led to unplanned outages beyond what Hydro would have predicted. That has affected the performance of the nuclear stations. The figures which the honourable member has quoted are the ones that I understand to be correct. Quite clearly, that is a concern for Ontario Hydro, although I think we would continue to acknowledge that the performance of the Candu reactors is regarded to be among the top nuclear reactors in the world.

Nevertheless, Ontario Hydro has taken some steps, at the time that the problems with the pressure tube situation were discovered some years ago, to correct the design problem so that future reactors would not encounter similar problems. It is carrying out a very active program, well in advance of its schedule for replacement of the pressure tubes, to ensure that there will not be unexpected outages in the nuclear plants in the future.

I think the second part of the honourable member's question related to longer-term demand-supply and he may want to follow that up in a supplementary.

Mr Charlton: The minister should know that the current operations at the Bruce A reactor are at less than 50% capacity, and that has absolutely no relationship to the tubes problem which the minister is referring to.

Mr Holt made a number of comments to the annual conference of the Canadian Nuclear Association which I think are very interesting and revealing in terms of things that we have been told. Hydro has said on a number of occasions that it has made energy efficiency its top priority. The minister and the Premier have said here in the House that Ontario Hydro has the most ambitious energy efficiency program of any utility in North America. Mr Holt said to the nuclear association that long-term reliability is a concern because Ontario has no major alternative to nuclear.

That is a clear reflection of Hydro's view on the other issues that are out there in electrical energy: efficiency, parallel generation and industrial co-generation. When is the minister going to step in and ensure that the rhetoric that has been spouted here in this House and in Hydro documents—

The Speaker: Thank you. Would you explain the rhetoric, please?

Hon Mrs McLeod: Before responding to the substance of the supplementary question, I did point out in my first answer that it was not just a pressure tube problem but in fact also a problem in the Bruce situation with steam generating station buildup and the fact that it has resulted in some cleanup.

I think the honourable member is well aware of what government has in fact done to address the question of supply-demand needs in the future. Ontario Hydro has submitted its demand-supply plans. Yes, nuclear is one of the options put forward by Ontario Hydro, but there are as well other alternatives put forward by Hydro as part of its plans to meet the long-term electricity demand, including a very aggressive, energy efficiency conservation program.

Our policy as the Ontario government has been to support very strongly the energy efficiency conservation program as well as programs of parallel generation and, furthermore, to have a full environmental assessment review of the plan that has been put forward by Ontario Hydro, including the appropriateness of the options that Hydro has put forward. That would include, of course, an analysis of the energy efficiency conservation program.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr Cousens: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I have a copy of the recent survey from the member for Eglinton to her constituents looking for areas to reduce government spending. Indeed, we all want to see the government control its spending.

One section in the survey suggests, "Reduce or eliminate unconditional grants to municipalities whereby there is no accountability for money spent." The statement suggests that

municipalities have no accountability for moneys spent, which prompts me to ask the minister if he believes that there is no accountability for unconditional grants at the municipal level.

Hon Mr Sweeney: I am sure if the honourable member would turn to his right and ask my colleague sitting right beside him, he would find that the thrust of her question was the distinction between conditional grants for health, social services and education versus unconditional grants, where there is no specific purpose for which they are given. That is the only way in which my colleague is using the term "accountability."

Mr Cousens: It is a real opportunity that the government uses to send up a trial balloon to see if this is another way in which there can be spending cuts. It is another way of having a survey. They can pay for surveys or they can have their backbenchers do it for them. The fact is that the municipalities of this province are under heavy pressure with spending controls right now by virtue of all the extra things having to do with the municipal-industrial strategy for abatement, pay equity and courtroom security.

What I am concerned about is whether or not this is a direction the government is going to take. Is this survey indicating something of a new government direction, namely, the elimination of unconditional grants, without even consulting the communities it will affect, or can the minister give us a commitment today that he will not be cutting back on unconditional grants and that he will be doing more for them than he has? It is a 2.4% increase over the last two years, only 4.8% this year. What is his commitment to the municipalities?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I would point out to my honourable colleague that the transfer of grants from the provincial government to the municipalities this year is up over 11%. The total amount of money now being transferred to municipalities is in excess of \$5 billion. The total amount of money being transferred to municipalities through unconditional grants is approximately \$1 billion, or about 20% of the total amount that we spend. No, we have no intention at the present time of in any way changing the unconditional grants.

As a matter of fact, the honourable member may be aware of the fact that we now have a joint advisory committee, co-chaired by Grant Hopcroft, the chairman of AMO, and the member for Durham-York, my parliamentary assistant, looking at ways in which the unconditional grants may be restructured so that they will be more effectively available to the municipalities of this province. They are involved in that process themselves.

1430

PROTECTION OF TREES

Mr Faubert: My question is also for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Last Wednesday 30 May, I attended a demonstration organized by tenants of 1955 to 1991 Victoria Park Avenue, protesting, among other concerns, the cutting down of about 70 mature trees around their property by their landlord. Apparently, the city of Scarborough does not have a bylaw in place to regulate the cutting of trees on private property.

Many neighbourhoods in my riding and throughout Scarborough, and indeed throughout cities and towns across Ontario, are at an age where they know the trees add a substantial contribution to the character of their communities. Many cities and towns are interested in protecting their trees from random and indiscriminate cutting.

Can the minister advise if the municipalities presently have the legislative authority to regulate the cutting down of trees on private property?

Hon Mr Sweeney: I thank my honourable colleague. Under the Trees Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Natural Resources, municipalities can pass bylaws to prevent cutting of what we call woodlots. The honourable member will probably be aware of the fact, though, that municipalities do not have the authority to prevent the cutting down of a single tree or one or two trees on a piece of private property.

One of the ways in which municipalities will often exercise their authority, however, is, if there is any developmental work going on, municipalities, including those in Metropolitan Toronto, will often make the saving of a certain number of trees conditional upon the issuing of the development permit. But in the particular situation which the honourable member indicated, I do not believe, unless I misunderstood him, there was any development activity going on. So in that particular case, no, they do not have that authority.

Mr Faubert: I believe there is little public disagreement that trees beautify cities and indeed that there is action that should be taken, in the lack of the legislative authority, to allow municipalities to pass such bylaws to protect the trees of our communities.

I would like to ask the minister if he would consider legislative amendments to enable Ontario municipalities to control the cutting down of trees.

Hon Mr Sweeney: The honourable member might be aware of the fact that, for example, the city of Toronto has been able to control the cutting down of trees in ravine areas. He may also be aware of the fact that our mutual colleague the member for St Andrew-St Patrick has been asked by the Premier to do a review of the valleys and the greening of the greater Toronto area. He will be bringing in some recommendations to us with respect to that particular issue, and we will be looking forward to those.

The honourable member may also be aware of the fact that my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources, in collaboration with a number of our colleagues, is looking at the entire planning process to see to what extent in fact we can expand the Trees Act into the urban areas.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon Mr Sweeney: Given all of that, I would suggest to my colleague that there probably—

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Sweeney: —is an ability of a municipality to apply that—

The Speaker: Order.

Mr D. S. Cooke: And all that was through the Speaker.

Hon Mr Sweeney: All through the Speaker.

The Speaker: I was just going to ask that. New question, the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore.

WATER QUALITY

Mrs Grier: My question is for the Minister of Health. Yesterday the minister told me in response to a question that her ministry supports the Ministry of the Environment in its efforts to ensure that the people of Ontario have safe drinking water.

I have just received an announcement from the Ministry of the Environment which says that under the MISA program, the municipal-industrial strategy for abatement, the minister will be monitoring the waste water from electric power generators, including the province's nuclear power plants. But the ministry is not going to monitor the level of radioactivity in the waste water from those plants.

Can the Minister of Health tell the House whether or not she agrees with me that exposure to even low levels of radioactivity can affect human health?

Hon Mrs Caplan: I would say to the member opposite, who I know is very concerned about all of these matters, that in fact the Ministry of the Environment has the lead on these matters and the Ministry of Health, through public health officials, is always prepared to give it expert advice.

Mrs Grier: That is certainly a relief to know, because I am sure the minister will agree with me that there is widespread concern about the safety of our nuclear industry and that this concern is always expressed in terms of concern and worry about radioactivity.

Whenever I ask the Minister of the Environment about discharges to waterways, he trots out MISA as the government's answer to every problem. Yet when we get this latest monitoring regulation under MISA, there is the glaring omission of radioactive emissions from the nuclear power plants.

Will the Minister of Health, in view of her ongoing co-operation with the Minister of the Environment, give us an undertaking that she will work with the Minister of the Environment to amend the monitoring regulation so that we can begin to control the environmental and health effects of nuclear plants?

Hon Mrs Caplan: As a minister who is always extremely concerned about the health of the population of Ontario, I would say how proud I am of the efforts of our Ministry of the Environment and our Minister of the Environment, who have developed the kind of environmental policies which are acknowledged to be leaders in North America.

I think the MISA program is just one example of the kind of progressive environmental policies of this government and of the Minister of the Environment. I am proud to serve in cabinet with him, and I would say to the member that the environmental issues of this province are in good hands under his leadership.

MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES STAFF DAY

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. I guess all members might be interested in hearing that on Thursday 14 June, the financial resources branch of the Ministry of Natural Resources will be holding what is being billed as its annual staff day. Included in the day's schedule are such vital public service activities as an obstacle course, a full steak and fish barbecue, miniature golf, a fishing derby and even time to be spent in a swimming pool.

To ensure that everyone at the ministry's financial resources branch reaps the full benefits of this staff day, attendance at this event on a working day is absolutely mandatory, and I am led to believe that if anyone does not really want to go out, he may be docked a full day's pay, presumably for lost opportunities for professional development.

How many more of these staff days will the minister be having within her ministry this year and at what cost to Ontario taxpayers?

Hon Mrs McLeod: I would certainly be happy on another occasion to provide the honourable member with detailed financial information as to the cost of staff and professional development within the ministry. I do not have those figures before me right now.

I would certainly not make any apology on behalf of the ministry for encouraging opportunities for staff development and professional development within our staff. I would want to assure myself as well as all members of the House that those staff days are in fact well used for professional activities and I undertake to ensure that that is the case in this particular instance.

Mr Jackson: I did not ask the minister where she was finding the money to do it. I was asking her why she was doing it.

On 14 June, her ministry will be busing more than 80 people to Terra Cotta Conservation Area for a good time, whether they like it or not, at an estimated cost of about \$10,000 to Ontario taxpayers to cover the wages, the transportation and the food.

Yesterday the Liberal member for Kitchener raised the plight of the hungry and the needy in his riding as a result of her government's cutbacks to St John's Kitchen in the amount of \$40,000, at a time when the number of his constituents who are seeking support and assistance is on the increase. St John's Kitchen is planning a rally for this weekend to demonstrate its community support and to try to convince her government that this is an inappropriate cutback and that her government should somehow find the moneys in order to ensure that these food banks do not close.

The Speaker: Do you have a question?

Mr Jackson: Could the minister please advise us how it is that one minister has to cut access to food banks in this province while she has money for a fun-in-the-sun picnic—

The Speaker: Minister.

Mr Jackson: —or is this just another example of the perverse priorities of the Peterson government?

1440

Hon Mrs McLeod: I think the honourable member is very well aware of the very inappropriate juxtaposition that he is making in asking the question in this way. I would put forward the proposal that the activities of each of the ministries of government are extremely important, that we attempt within our priorities to balance the budget fairly between those activities as well as we are able. It then becomes the responsibility of each ministry to ensure that the budget allocated is used in a responsible way for its own priorities.

The honourable member has a very long record in the field of education, and I know he would agree with me that professional development and staff development are absolutely crucial to the effective functioning of any enterprise. What I indicated in my first response and reiterate is that I would expect that all staff development dollars are spent in a way which assures effective professional development of the Ministry of Natural Resources staff. I will undertake to ensure that this is the case in this instance.

PAY EQUITY

Ms Oddie Munro: My question is to the Minister of Labour. The Pay Equity Commission of Ontario, in its report to the minister in October 1989, listed three options by employers

in determining the pay equity adjustment for female job classes which did not find a male comparator under the search sequence set out in the act. These additional options recommended were proportional value, proxy comparison and average adjustment. On 2 March 1990, the minister announced proposed amendments to the Pay Equity Act.

In response to his recommendations, the Pay Equity Commission accepted the proportional value recommendation. Since the government is committed to the implementation of the Pay Equity Act and since the proportional value recommendation provided a mechanism to bring women who do not have male comparators into the wage adjustment scheme, could the minister indicate the numbers of women who will be affected and the likely careers involved?

Hon Mr Phillips: I appreciate the question and I agree with the member that we are indeed committed to pay equity and pay equity legislation. Just to refresh our memories on the numbers we are talking about here, there are about 2,250,000 women in the Ontario workplace. Some 500,000 of them work for the federal government, federally regulated companies or companies of nine or fewer employees; they were never intended to be covered by the pay equity legislation. So we are talking about a total of 1,750,000 women in the Ontario workplace whom the pay equity legislation was designed to benefit.

We found that the one mechanism that we have in the act, namely, the male comparator, was working for about 1,400,000 women, leaving about 350,000 women who could not benefit from the legislation. It is true, as the member said, that we are proceeding to allow a second method. It is called proportional value. We estimate that that will add about 240,000 additional women who can benefit from the pay equity legislation, bringing about 1,650,000 out of 1,750,000, about 95%.

Ms Oddie Munro: Perhaps the minister can outline the careers involved in that 1.7 million. If the male comparator and proportional value formula cover 95% of the women in the workforce, and I understand they do, and if the proxy comparison and external average adjustment are intended to capture the remaining 5%, would the minister indicate when he will be in a position to look at these two recommendations so that 100% of women will be covered by the act?

Hon Mr Phillips: This, of course, is the matter that many groups have raised with us. The original intent of the pay equity legislation was to ensure that, within what is called an establishment or a company or an employer, there was equity; in other words, that women were treated fairly and equitably. That is why we are proposing the addition of proportional value.

The additional two methods that were proposed by the Pay Equity Commission, namely, proxy and average adjustment, would both involve going outside the establishment, finding a comparator outside the employer. Frankly, that is something that the pay equity legislation had not envisioned. We are looking for other remedies, apart from the pay equity legislation.

A couple of the ministers have announced in the last two years remedies to help those women who are not covered by the pay equity legislation, those 105,000 women who tend to be in child care and homemakers. But right now the pay equity legislation is not designed to provide the remedy for them and the most likely solution will be through other mechanisms.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Wildman: I have a question for the Minister of Financial Institutions with regard to the effectiveness of the new auto

insurance regime in this province and how it affects a small taxicab company in Wawa in my riding.

Can the minister explain how it is that this company, which has six cabs on the road and is insured by Co-operators through the Facility Association, would have a 30% increase in premiums this year, even though it has had no accidents and no traffic violations in the year, and at the same time the insurance company would inform the cab company that its comprehensive deductible would change from \$50 to \$1,000? How is it that this company is getting much less coverage and protection for such a great increase in premiums?

Hon Mr Elston: I presume that rate has been sent out under the old regime. Of course, the member realizes that we were held up here for a considerable length of time in dealing with the legislation. His party spearheaded that. In fact, the member was one of the people who was in this House saying, "We will do everything we can to prevent the bill from being passed." The bill was designed to provide reasonable rates for us in the province.

The answer to the member's question is that I do not know his taxi company, but I will take a look at what the circumstances are around it and reply to him in due course. But for him to stand here and blame the new regime for that when in fact the bill for premiums was obviously sent out under the old regime is inappropriate and is almost unexplainable to the public in general.

PETITIONS

MUNICIPAL REORGANIZATION

Mr Wildman: I have a petition signed by approximately 1,000 permanent and seasonal residents of the area north of Sault Ste Marie called Sault North by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. This petition is presented because the ministry has done a study and has had a number of meetings regarding the possibility of setting up a municipal organization in the area.

The petitioners are requesting that the provincial government not proceed with municipal organization in Sault North unless local residents petition the Ontario Municipal Board to hold a local hearing on municipal organization proposals. Also, the petitioners are determined that the two communities of Heyden and Goulais River not be combined in one township municipality at any time but that they remain separate entities.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Miss Roberts: I have a petition from about 200 people in my riding and other ridings throughout Ontario respectfully requesting the government of Ontario to provide time for opt-in classes in all the public schools for the teaching of Christian religious education and moral ethics to all those students whose parents request it, and if this cannot be provided, requesting publicly funded Christian schools on the same basis as the Roman Catholic schools.

I have affixed my name to these pursuant to the standing orders.

ELECTIONS

Mr McLean: This is addressed to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To create and maintain an actual positive law which would embody the general principle of normative order.

"Law and order are indispensable elements of our civilized life and the principle of our Constitution. This law must address and regulate the fair and just process of calling an election. This law shall be an extension of section 41 of the charter and must consider all relevant rights and freedoms as guaranteed in the charter."

"As I have been informed by government officials, there is no law regulating such matters. At present, an election will be called depending upon the will or pleasure of the officials. This is arbitrary power and not permitted by our Constitution. How and when elections are called in the light of section 4(1) must be a law.

This is a petition from Mr Freitag from Penetanguishene, and I have signed my signature to it.

LANDFILL SITE

Mr Pollock: I have a petition here addressed to the Parliament of Ontario and signed by 4,400 people objecting to the Marmoraton Mine area being used as a landfill site. I understand there are lots more to come. I have affixed my signature to this petition.

1450

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ST GEORGE'S SOCIETY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Mr Reville moved first reading of Bill Pr90, An Act respecting St George's Society of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Mancini moved first reading of Bill 176, An Act to amend the Assessment Act.

Motion agreed to.

The Speaker: Is there an explanation?

Hon Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, with your permission, I have three short paragraphs to enter into the record.

The bill has two main purposes. First, it will discontinue the enumeration that the Ministry of Revenue conducts of multi-residential units in municipal non-election years; second, it will introduce a four-year equalization cycle.

The basis for provincial grants to municipalities has shifted to household units from population. This has lessened the need for the mini-enumeration.

The four-year equalization cycle will replace the current annual process. However, where a significant change occurs in the assessment base of any municipality, the Ministry of Revenue will make the necessary calculations upon request.

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA ACT, 1990

Mrs Marland moved first reading of Bill Pr78, An Act respecting the City of Mississauga.

Motion agreed to.

AXA HOME INSURANCE COMPANY ACT, 1990

Ms Poole moved first reading of Bill Pr69, An Act respecting AXA Home Insurance Company.

Motion agreed to.

TOWN OF SIMCOE ACT, 1990

Mr Miller moved first reading of Bill Pr66, An Act respecting the Town of Simcoe.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT, 1989

LOI DE 1989 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE CODE DE LA ROUTE

Mr Wrye moved second reading of Bill 96, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

M. Wrye propose la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 96, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur le code de la route.

Hon Mr Wrye: This legislation, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, is now at long last before the House for second reading. I expect a lively and interesting second reading and I expect some interesting discussions in the next while.

Through the extension of allowable truck lengths, this bill will address several key objectives of the government: highway safety, economic competitiveness, the protection of our environment and physical infrastructure, and the management of congestion.

This bill does not compromise highway safety.

Mr Laughtren: Oh, we don't expect you to admit that.

Hon Mr Wrye: I hope my friends in the official opposition will listen to this because members of that party from other provinces, whom they like to quote when the times are appropriate, were part of that standard-setting group.

In recommending the new standards to the Canadian Council of Transportation Ministers, including the minister from Manitoba under the late and unlamented New Democratic Party government, the Roads and Transportation Association of Canada—that is, the association of provincial motor vehicle regulators—made three main points.

First, the two-metre or five-foot extension would provide a lower centre of gravity for trailer loads. Second, it would allow the use of longer wheelbase tractors with the engine in front of the cab, a configuration which is less likely to jackknife. Finally, the longer tractor would provide the space for a full sleeping cabin to allow easier compliance with the National Safety Code limits on hours of work.

It has been some time before this legislation came to this Legislature. It has been in front of other legislatures prior to this. Our decision not to proceed with this legislation at the time that other jurisdictions did was taken because of the National Safety Code. We wanted to ensure that all elements of the code—the hours of work, the pre-trip inspection, the air brake endorsement and the facility audit—were in full operation.

I am pleased to report to all members of the House that all of those important safety components which are part and parcel of the overall vision that we have for how to bring about a safe trucking industry are now in place and that indeed facility audits are now under way, not only in Canada but in the United States, where the first of our facility audits is under way even this day as I speak.

1500

The ability of our industries to compete in domestic and international markets will be enhanced by bringing our regulations into uniformity with those of our major trading partners. The proposed increases from 48- to 53-foot trailers and from 23 to 25 metres for double trailer combination vehicles, all subject to the stringent safety standards laid down by RTAC, are designed to allow a free flow of goods across our borders.

The longer double trailer combinations are now standard in western Canada, on the US Interstate system and, under permit, on designated highways in Quebec, while the west and 35 of the 50 American states, including all of the states bordering Ontario, permit 53-foot trailers. Recent events at our border crossings have shown the anxiety of certain segments of our trucking industry about their ability to compete against other regulatory environments. Ontario's continued prosperity is in no small way tied to the efficient movement of our products and services by road. Trucks now haul 70% of the goods which are shipped in Ontario and are constantly increasing their market share.

The increase to an overall length of 25 metres will apply only to double trailer combination vehicles that meet the exacting technical safety specifications of the road transport association. This change will therefore encourage the greater use of the safer B train as opposed to the A- and C-train combinations, which have been found in RTAC studies to not be as safe. B trains now comprise only about half the double trailer combination vehicles operating in this province, and under this new standard we expect that those figures will rise quite dramatically in the years to come. At the same time, we propose a slight addition to overall length of certain single trailers and double trailer combinations.

At the same time, we plan to introduce two important measures regarding axles: one to further improve safety, the other to reduce wear and tear on our pavements. When this bill goes to committee, I propose to introduce the following:

First, that all trailers constructed to the new specifications be equipped with wide-track axles. Greater axle widths will make loaded trailers less likely to tip in any situation and particularly in those situations where they are most likely to tip now, and that is on highway access ramps. As any of my friends in the House who travel the highways as much as I do will be aware, that is the greatest danger point now. This measure, which we expect to introduce in committee, will help alleviate that.

The second proposal is that no trailers constructed to the new lengths be equipped with so-called lift axles. These are the axles which currently allow a transport to carry heavier legal loads but which unfortunately must be raised to negotiate turns, thus causing strain on the pavement. Municipalities have quite properly raised this as a concern, and we intend to alleviate their concerns with an amendment in committee.

The larger capacity of trailers has a further potential for reducing wear and tear on our highways, since it may lead to an overall reduction in the number of trucks on our roads.

Mr Pouliot: You don't believe that, do you?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Wrye: I simply refer my colleagues from all parties to comments and letters written by groups as diverse as Hostess potato chips and Sears, both of which have indicated that the number of trucks that they will require with the greater capacity, indeed with the lesser weight, may actually be reduced

in the range of 5% to 10%. I think all of us would find that quite welcome.

Putting it in basic, simpler terms, so that my good friend the member for Lake Nipigon will understand it, the freight tonnage which is now on our highways will be carried in fewer vehicles under the new dimensions. Added to that will be the significant benefits to our environment which result from reduced fuel consumption and vehicle emissions, as well as the possible reduction in highway congestion.

At this point, I want to just talk about, and hopefully dispel, three misconceptions which appear to have arisen about the new dimensions.

The first misconception—and I hope my friend the member for Lake Nipigon will not repeat it after I can hopefully dispel it—is that the greater dimensions will mean heavier trucks. That is simply not the case. There is no change proposed or contemplated in the gross vehicle allowances on Ontario's highways.

Mr Pouliot: So bigger trucks weigh less. Good logic.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon Mr Wrye: Longer does not and will not mean heavier, and of course I look forward to my friends in the official opposition pointing out anywhere in the bill that refers to heavier maximum loads being allowed. I will wait with bated breath while my friend the member for Lake Nipigon, or perhaps my good friend the learned member for Nickel Belt, points out in his remarks that specific section in the bill.

There is a second misconception, that the two-metre extension to double combinations and the five-foot addition to allowable single trailer lengths are the thin edge of the wedge to the eventual introduction of so-called monster trucks. Let me say to the House today what I said to the Ontario Trucking Association in November and have said since, and I repeat it again today in the most emphatic terms: This ministry and this minister have no intention of deviating from the slight vehicle lengths proposed first by RTAC and now contained in Bill 96. The 120-foot-long double and triple combinations that are allowed in some states, and indeed in some western provinces, will not be permitted on Ontario roads.

The third misconception which I believe is important to dispel right now is that heavy trucks are involved in more accidents than other vehicles. Statistics reveal quite the opposite. Only 2% of all Ontario accidents involve trailers, semitrailers and double trailer combination vehicles. The accident rate for large trucks is, on an exposure basis, about one third that recorded by the general vehicle population. The present large truck accident rate is only 0.97 per 100,000 kilometres driven. On the US Interstate system, where the 25-metre and 53-foot limits have been in use for some time, that rate is even lower, at 0.76.

I would not be advocating the adoption of new truck dimensions if I were not absolutely convinced that they can further improve the safety record of large trucks and that in other ways they present no additional risk to the situation on the highways, which I as a regular driver understand as one which gives a lot of concern to the population. Safety has been the first priority in all the deliberations that have led up to this bill.

The national body of motor vehicle administration, RTAC, is convinced, and said so some time ago after thorough technical research, that the standards it has developed are safe. To those standards I am adding a new one, wider axles, which will produce even greater safety.

I look forward to the debate that will follow and to hearing from my friends in logical and rational and unemotional terms, as I always do, the concerns that they have. I look forward to being able, as the debate proceeds, to address those concerns. I know that, as concerned as they are for both the workers and consumers of Ontario—

Mr Pouliot: And motorists.

Hon Mr Wrye: —and motorists of this province, all of my friends in this Legislature will be able to see their way clear at the end of the debate, having had their concerns addressed and answered, to come forward in support of what is a good piece of legislation for the motoring public, for the consumers and for the workers of this province.

I believe the amendments will have, as I said at the outset, only positive implications for safety on our highways, for the competitiveness of this province in economic terms—which is important to workers—for the environment, for the infrastructure and for the growing problem of congestion which this government is trying to address all over this province.

I urge the House to proceed with passage of Bill 96 as quickly as possible and I look forward to the debate as it moves forward.

1510

Mr Pouliot: I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words about the main features of Bill 96. Really, the major component here is to make long trucks longer, if you wish. For the Minister of Transportation in Ontario, larger trucks are the issue. For people in the New Democratic Party, safety is the larger issue.

What we are talking about here is simply making trucks six feet or six and a half feet longer. You have seen them, Mr Speaker. You are an educated man. You have your driver's licence. You drive back and forth to your constituency. I know that as a motorist you have very serious concerns regarding trucks at the present time, because you are a member of a Parliament and you know that the government does not monitor compliance when it comes to safety.

Before I get on to monster trucks and demonstrate that in some cases those monster trucks become killer trucks and that calamities or catastrophes abound on our highways, I would like to read a letter that was addressed to the Minister of Transportation from the township of Terrace Bay, on behalf of the residents in that small, resource municipality in northwestern Ontario, located on the Trans-Canada Highway, Highway 17. People are pleading with the minister, saying: "Don't do it, minister. We're frightened. We're petrified."

The letter reads:

"Dear Mr Wrye:

"The Terrace Bay council would like to express its concern over the government's intention to allow longer trucks on Ontario highways. While there may be benefits to the added length in southern Ontario, council believes that longer trucks in northwestern Ontario will create a greater safety hazard.

"Terrace Bay is located on Highway 17, the only highway across the north shore of Lake Superior. We are routinely faced with poor driving conditions, with snow and ice in the winter, and rain and fog in the summer months. In addition to the weather, Highway 17 is narrow, with few passing lanes and few paved shoulders, many hills and curves, and is often in poor condition with many bumps and potholes.

"In northern Ontario, in that special part of the province, your ministry does not fix the bumps. It simply advertises them.

So it is not rare for the good people of Terrace Bay and other municipalities who have to travel that road to see bump, bump, bump, with little or no attention paid to them in terms of fixing, remedying the situation or monitoring compliance on maintenance during the winter months.

"We are also faced with the hazards of moose on the highway. Trying to pass transports now under these conditions is frequently a harrowing experience and council is concerned that longer trucks will only make it worse. It will also become harder and more dangerous for transports to pass other transports. We already have a high accident and fatality rate on Highway 17. Council is afraid that longer trucks will make this worse.

"Until such time as Highway 17 is upgraded to four lanes, council is opposed to allowing the trucks and requests that the government withdraw its bill allowing them, or amend it to exclude northwestern Ontario.

"Thank you very much for your attention."

Well, thank you, David C. Fulton, clerk-treasurer/administrator of the township of Terrace Bay, for standing up. Do you believe, David C. Fulton and Mayor Ziegler, that you will have an impact? Do you not believe that this legislation will be steamrollered through the assembly?

I know that you are frightened of them, Mr Speaker, because we have lost some people we knew. People who choose to be up north move there to improve their lot but also to make a contribution. They are no longer with us. There is not a person in a small town in northwestern Ontario who is not aware in the recent past of a fatality, a fatality because truck transportation has more than doubled in the past eight years in the northwest, a fatality because there are few passing lanes, a fatality because trucks travel in convoys.

Mr Speaker, you know what happens if you have the unfortunate event where during a winter month you go on and you start passing one of those huge transports. You hit the ditch. You lose control. It takes you longer than you thought. Now it is going to take a full second longer. You wonder whether you are going to make it or not. You are three quarters of the way through and you are starting to go downhill. Yes, you begin to die. Obviously, more often than not, you have exercised a good deal of patience. You are an experienced driver and you may be able to make it to another truck.

The people are not saying that the minister has blood on his hands. They are not saying that. But they are very much aware that if you get involved in a head-on collision with a truck, that if you get sideswiped by a truck, you do not have to be concerned about your injuries being catastrophic and permanent. That is not a concern. You go straight from the car to the bag. That is the sad reality of the result of a situation like this. When catastrophe or calamity strikes, that is what happens to you. You are dead, dead, dead. Statistics will certainly attest to and demonstrate that. It is an unfair match. You do not have much of a chance if you get involved in a car accident versus a truck. Inevitably people in a car will fare far worse.

I have another letter. Again, people are most generous, believing that somehow big government will listen to us, to small people, that it will not only be the proverbial rich and powerful against us. I recall; I know the minister. It was about three months ago. I dare the minister to stand up in this House, with respect, and tell me that he has not changed his mind, because the major Toronto papers—I have an article for verification that says the following, that the Minister of Transportation as recently as three to four months ago was against longer trucks on our highways. The reason he was

against was the safety factor. The minister was not sure that longer trucks would be safe.

Now, three to four months after—I hope he gets up on a point of order to say: "Well, the member for Lake Nipigon is in error. He is imputing motive." The minister has changed his mind on the road to Damascus. Who got to the minister? Why did he change his mind? What happened in the last three to four months so that the minister reversed his decision? He has flip-flopped on such an important and relevant issue. Why? Who got to him? He is now standing in the middle of the road. You know what happens when you stand in the middle of the road on an issue? You risk getting run over by both sides. So we do not know where the minister is at. We do not know.

I have a letter from Donald E. Burkett. Mr Burkett, we wish to thank you. From Brantford in southern Ontario he has the courage to write a letter; he is aged 67, with 51 years of driving experience. Again, it is addressed to the Minister of Transportation in the glass and cement towers located at 77 Wellesley Street West:

"I wish to add my protest to those received from many people re the proposed legislation to permit longer trucks and trailers on our highways. In my view, to pass this legislation would be extremely inappropriate, dangerous and foolhardy. The ever-increasing number of the already too-big trucks on our highways is a burden on our highway system. Please do not try to tell me that longer rigs will be easier on the road surfaces. I do not believe it.

"From the standpoint of safety, the high incidence of accidents involving trucks indicates the need for better road work in these regulations, better driving training and better enforcement by police of highway laws, particularly speed. In my experience, particularly on the 401 between Brantford and Ottawa, I have tried to clock huge trucks with some semi-plus pup trailers and had to give up when my speedometer reached 125 kilometres an hour.

1520

"And the truck, they kept pulling away from me. They were going faster. I was chased off the left lane, living in Brantford and frequently driving to Hamilton for the cancer society."

That is quite touching. This gentleman puts the welfare of others ahead of his own. He is 67 years of age and wants to keep giving more to the system and wants to stay alive doing it. So his endeavours, his good deeds, ask that he travel the highway. He is now saying it is a safety hazard.

"Certainly, bigger trucks are not wanted or needed on this section of the road. So please don't let a few truck trailer corporations"—he is right; those are the people who got to the minister—"or American greed talk you into passing this dangerous and most unpopular legislation."

Donald E. Burkett, salutations and greetings; thank you very kindly. The list goes on and on of concerned citizens who have been observing the increase in truck traffic, who have had to bury close friends and relatives because of the lack of monitoring of compliance in the existing system.

I have a letter from Wendy Kane and David Hunt of Newburgh; they are saying pretty well the same thing: "We are deeply concerned about the recent move by your government to allow longer transport vehicles access to Ontario highways. As frequent highway travellers"—these two people travel together; they are concerned about the 401, simply put. Broadly summarized, this letter is too gory to go into the record. It is a chilling account of what happens.

The Minister of Transportation acquiesces to the concerns. He says, "We are very concerned." But someone got to him. He had the gall, a few minutes ago, on his feet, to tell us that we will have fewer trucks on the highway. Now get this gem, Mr Speaker, we will do this together. We will have fewer trucks on the highway. They will be bigger, but they will weigh less and we are going to move the same number of goods. How do you explain that? Where is the logic in this? That borders on the farcical. I am going to try again. I am going to try to stay within the line.

Can the minister explain? Because this is what I am quoting verbatim. This is what he has said. "The trucks will be longer, but they will not weigh any more." Well, bigger trucks weigh more than smaller trucks. The pages here know that very well. You are not going to move the same number of goods and say that you have 10% fewer trucks and they weigh less. Something does not add up. But we are supposed to swallow what the minister says. I am telling the minister he should check his figures.

Mr Laughren: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The chief government whip tells me she does not think there is a quorum. I wonder whether you could check that out.

The Deputy Speaker: A quorum is present. The member for Lake Nipigon may continue.

Mr Pouliot: May I take this opportunity, with respect, to thank the member for Nickel Belt who, who knows, has not chosen to elope, to leave the chamber. He knows this is an important issue. He has talked to me in the corridor and in my office privately and he has talked officially about the dilemma, the impasse that we are about to be presented with by way of legislation.

I want to thank you, Mr Speaker, as a leader, with respect, as a referee of the Assembly. You knew that the House was not duly constituted. I admire that in you, sir. You knew that some members, some of the 94 members of the House were embarrassed and had chosen to leave, had chosen not to be at their posts when it came to longer trucks because they too sense and deep down they know very well, they share in our concern, and they join with the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees. The largest rail union in Canada wishes to inform the House of its concern. "Rail Union Fights Larger Trucks."

"The longer they are, the harder they are to pass." We all know this. Remember, we began to die; we are about to jack-knife with the following presentation from an expert. "We have no self-confidence if you make them longer." There has been no public input. The minister will be judged very harshly.

"The average automobile is no match versus a big truck." We have already been through this. It says exactly what I said. "Hardly a soul in the Ottawa Valley has not been touched by the rash of tragic accidents on Highway 17, and if the Ontario government gets its way, the killer highway will get worse." Oh, world-class; second to none. The people of the largest railway union in Canada have designated, have shamed Highway 17, the Trans-Canada. They are calling it a killer highway. In fact, in the month of April past alone, four people have died, have lost their lives.

"Mayor Des Adam from Kanata doubts whether a resolution from the townships around Ottawa will have any weight in the provincial Legislature," because the not-so-illustrious group of 10 or group of 15 will shove this kind of ill-thought-out and ill-fated legislation down the throat of the opposition, and more important, down the throat of the people, the motorists of Ontario.

I would like to bring to members' attention, again concerning safety, that if I were the Minister of Transportation for this great province the first thing I would assure myself of—paramount, the first line in my mandate as Minister of Transportation, more important than anything else, the major component—is that my major focus would be safety. The minister said that himself three to four months ago and has failed to date to explain to the House why he has changed his mind. Research data from his own ministry will attest that larger trucks are a safety hazard.

I want to take you on a short trip, Mr Speaker. John Woodroffe is Canada's foremost expert; he is the recognized expert on tractor-trailer rigs. Does the minister know what he says about his legislation? He says the minister is out to lunch. He says the minister does not know what he is talking about when he talks about axles. They do not monitor compliance. People are overcapacitated, so it does not matter what the regulation says. The minister knows that.

I want to share with you, Mr Speaker, an evening most unlike yesterday or today, in February in northwestern Ontario, between the township of Schreiber and the township of Marathon, where rock cuts abound, you are on Trans-Canada Highway 17. You have a depression system coming from Lake Superior, which is not at all unusual. You have snowstorms. The temperature is about minus 10 degrees Celsius. It is not much colder than that. This true story has it that you have a snowstorm, so it is about minus 20 degrees Celsius.

1530

Mr Speaker, you are driving a tractor-trailer and you start going downhill on a single lane. The speed limit is 90 kilometres an hour, but there is black ice on the road by virtue of the atmospheric conditions and the time of year. You are only going maybe 60 kilometres an hour, but the conditions are such that you start to lose control just a tiny bit. The wheels jam, the brakes jam, the wheels go from lock to lock, those rock cuts loom larger and ever closer and you begin to die. You are about to jackknife. Everything—your life, the lives of those coming in the opposite direction, added to those who might be following—is put into jeopardy.

Luckily, in this case you hit the ditch. Half the rig on the highway, the front end in the ditch, small cuts but lots of blood to the driver. The highway is closed for six hours. It costs \$48,000 to fix the mess. And this is a happy situation. That is the best that can possibly happen.

One of the things when you buy a car is that all the components marry well. The thousands of smaller and larger parts that are necessary to assemble a car are connected. They are made for one part to go with the other, and the industry is monitored. You have to do it that way; it is the only way to build a car. You do not have the same thing with trucks, for when you replace parts, there is all kinds of latitude you can exercise, even when you go to axles.

Again, the minister has said the trucks will not weigh any more. I know what he is talking about. Let's be frank about this. He is talking about the repartition of weight vis-à-vis axles; one axle, so much weight. But he knows—and I cannot forgive the minister, because he knows; otherwise he would not be occupying that important post—that it is not easy to monitor compliance. Sometimes it is like mercury. Weight is not evenly distributed. He is saying the weight is not going to increase. Well, they are already overloaded in most cases, and the minister knows it. His ministry is telling him this. He can shake his

head all he wants. Mr Speaker, you are an educated man. You know who is telling the truth.

There were many who have spoken on behalf of municipalities. We have had letters from courageous citizens and others who are saying: "No, you have gone too far. We are not going to take it any more. We are frightened." The minister has had a letter from John Woodrooffe, from the largest railway union in the country.

I want to bring to your attention with the same approach, Mr Speaker, what the Canadian Automobile Association—yes, you know it, exactly. You make a sign with the sticker. That is CAA Ontario. They represent 1.3 million motorists. There are a lot of votes there. If there is one thing the Minister of Transportation understands, if there is one thing he can calculate, it is votes. Well, those 1.3 million motorists in Ontario are telling him this: They are opposed to Bill 96. This is the Ontario government's own study, indicating that longer trucks are unsafe. The Canadian Automobile Association, with 1.3 million members in Ontario.

A 1989 safety blitz—and I want to come back to this—revealed that 20% of the trucks inspected had to be pulled out of service. I cannot believe this, but the statistic that I have—the minister's statistics—are even higher. In other words, when the minister leaves here in the comfort and privacy of his limousine, paid at taxpayers' expense, and endeavours to journey to the Windsor area, where he is from, for every five trucks on the highway that he sees, or for every 100 hundred trucks, and there are thousands of them, 20%, one out of every five trucks that he sees, is unsafe; not unsafe by virtue of, on account of, by reason of a small defect—unsafe to the point where they have to be taken off the highway. They are not big then, they are not bouncers; they have a potential of becoming killer trucks.

I do not wish to catastrophize. There is no need to. Statistics will attest to it. They speak for themselves. And people are frightened. There is not one member of this House, with respect of course, who is not a bit apprehensive when he drives the highways of Ontario. When he drives and sees those trucks cutting in and cutting out, what is his reaction? He knows that one out of every five should not even be on the road. They should be taken off the road. They are a safety hazard. You have a potential killer on your hands, Mr Speaker.

Miss Martel: So much for monitoring compliance.

Mr Pouliot: So much for monitoring compliance, indeed.

It is obvious that the longer trucks will not make a bad situation better; longer trucks will make a bad situation far worse. Remember, Mr Speaker, again, the CAA offers for our consumption, for our edification, the following five one-liners, and I am quoting for the record. The CAA, the Canadian Automobile Association, representing 1.3 million motorists in Ontario, says the following, with passion and with some vengeance:

"Larger trucks intensify the effect of splash or spray and severely impair driving visibility." True or false? We will do it together. That is a simple one.

"Larger trucks mean accidents of greater human loss and property loss and a decrease in driver confidence." Well, they scare you half to death. Heaven knows, should you have some difficulties, and the member for Welland-Thorold, better than anyone, has illustrated that one must not expect compensation. You are on your own.

"Passing and basic driving manoeuvres for both truckers and automobile drivers become more difficult as vehicle length

increases." Well, you do not have to be a mathematical genius to figure that one out. The bigger the truck, the bigger the obstacle. It is going to take you longer to pass them. Of course they are longer.

Interjection.

Mr Pouliot: The minister says it may only take you one second to 1.5 seconds. Well, I guess we measure things on a different scale. What about if you do not make it, Mr Speaker?

1540

Back to the CAA: "Private motorists who already bear most of the road construction and maintenance costs do not want further road damage caused by larger trucks." The minister, in his opening remarks, says they are larger but the road will not be impacted. He is wrong, because one truck represents the equivalent of 10,000 cars. That is the impact on the road. That is how much damage one large truck does to the roads of Ontario. One truck is the same as 10,000 cars. Now the trucks are going to be larger, so I guess it will be right to assume, and that is what the experts say, you are going to have more damage on your roads. They are heavier. Of course they are heavier, because they are bigger.

Very few motorists believe the number of trucks will actually decrease, and studies have shown this to be true. There has been a shift from railways over the past decade, over the past 15 years, railways that are more favourable to the environment than trucking, and the shift has been to emphasize the trucking, so consequently the truck traffic in Ontario has far more than doubled since 1970.

I want to share with members the fears expressed by Transport 2000. Transport 2000 has a concern about this bill. They see it as an enormous issue. They see it as a very complex issue, and they tell the minister that public hearings are a necessity. They too wish to make a presentation. Those are expert people. When we are talking about Transport 2000, we are talking about people who are in the know. They too make the case of drivers' confidence vis-à-vis longer trucks.

On the perception by drivers, they have compiled some interesting studies that acquiesce. They found that in Ontario, only "14% of auto drivers felt that passing a large truck was of no more concern than passing another automobile." So if you have 100 drivers in Ontario at any one time, in any one spot, and you ask them: "How do you feel about passing another car? How do you feel about passing a truck?" only 14% will tell you, "Well, it is not much of a difference to me;" 86% are apprehensive.

Mr Laughren: That's on good roads.

Mr Pouliot: The member for Nickel Belt, so right, so timely, says, "That's on good roads." Of course, the number swings to 3%, less than 3%, on a rainy day. If it is raining, 97% of the drivers in Ontario are afraid to pass, are apprehensive, are concerned—in some cases, are petrified. On a rainy day 97% of the drivers, when passing a large truck, have less self-confidence, which will affect no doubt in many cases, in some cases certainly, their driving habits. They are beginning to lose a little confidence, in 97% of the cases, on rainy days.

Where you have the luxury or the convenience of a four-lane highway around the greater Toronto area, for instance, the number drops to 50%. It is less of a concern. Drivers are not as apprehensive in southern Ontario. They have a flat terrain in most cases. The weather conditions are more conducive to safer driving. Winters are not as long.

But venture north. One of the problems we have with the legislation, and it is a residual and perennial concern of ours, is that we have two Ontarios. We have the south and, in terms of roads, we have the less fortunate people up north.

Miss Martel: But we have the same health care.

Mr Pouliot: The member for Sudbury East so rightly says, "But we have the same health care." We used to pay the same health care premiums. We do not have the same proper health care in the north, of course, and we are all aware of it.

The minister refuses to acknowledge that conditions are different, the terrain is different and we have single lanes. He does not say anything regarding northern Ontario in terms of legislation. Well, Transport 2000—thank heaven those good soldiers are pointing that out. They are not at the mercy of a very intensified lobby.

The minister is very much aware that lobbying used to be a vulgar trade, but it is a very sophisticated endeavour now. He is certainly aware that it has evolved into an honourable profession. The minister has missed the boat. Excuse the pun in this case. He was not at his post. How can he not differentiate between the road system in the south and what we have to put up with in the north? What is the matter with him?

This is going to be difficult. I cannot divulge the source, but I have the annual report of the Ministry of Transportation, 1988-89. I want to share it with Ontarians, for they are funding this program.

You may cry, but try to laugh, Mr Speaker. It is much easier to laugh than to cry. Get this gem: "The transportation regulation program is responsible for the development and implementation of safety standards," and then we get Bill 96. I trusted the minister. I believed him, and he does this to us. "The work of this program ensures that Ontario's transportation system is used safely, legally and with regard to the wellbeing of all users."

Mr Speaker, have you heard of the person who once died laughing? This is farcical. There are so many contradictions that we could bring forward. The mandate does not mean a thing or, systematically and deliberately, by virtue of all the statistics we will bring forward, it is ignored. It is verbiage. It is mere words.

There again, if I were the minister, this would be the focus, and I touched on this briefly a few moments ago. This would be the credo. This would be what I adhere to, and I would put it into policies. I would put it in the real world because I would have at heart the human dimension. Legislation is for people, not to enhance the economic interests of a few lobbyists. It is for people, or it should be for people.

This is something else. The Provincial Auditor conducts value audits. I am honoured to serve as vice-chairman of the standing committee on public accounts for the province. I get the statistics from the government or I listen to the ministry intently and I try to hang on every word, and they contradict what the Provincial Auditor says.

1550

Interjection.

Mr Pouliot: Yes, they do indeed. I have them right here.

I am asked to believe the Minister of Transportation, a member of the government, or the Provincial Auditor. I know you cannot say it; you are tormented, Mr Speaker. I know who you believe and I know who I believe, but because they are both saying different things, completely different things, one of them is shying away from the truth, and it is not the Provincial Auditor. Well, who is it?

This is an interesting statistic. This is the Provincial Auditor, not me, saying this, sanctioned by the province of Ontario, completely and totally independent. He is saying that there is a backlog of some 100,000 with the Ministry of Transportation. Those are people who wish to join the motorists of Ontario and crowd our highways.

We all do it, but there are 100,000 people waiting in the wings, so it is going to put 100,000 more motorists on the highway. They are due, those people. It is just that, because of the inefficiency of the present system at the present time, they are unable to get their licence. The government is much quicker when it comes time to collect taxes. Then it is not one but both ends, but that is another and an ongoing problem.

It says, and these are the findings of the auditor, "The backlogs are growing as there are insufficient driver examiners." Do you know what the government's response is, the minister's response, Mr Speaker? They have an internal problem there. The minister's response is, "Discussions are under way with Management Board with respect to the overall resource level associated with this activity."

You are right, Mr Speaker. The safety component attached to Bill 96 should be the most important focus. The minister has talked about safety and has informed the House that he is proud of the safety records of his ministry. I want to share this with him. In the fiscal year 1988, 8,600 buses were inspected in Ontario. In 1987, they inspected 12,400, so they are losing ground there again. They have more buses, but less of them get inspected. In 1987, 12,400 buses were inspected. So within two years—now remember, they have more buses on the road, but they go from 12,400 in 1987 to 8,600. This is very consequential decrease indeed, exceeding or surpassing 30%.

I mean, the guy is not doing his job. He should either shape up or do the honourable thing while he has an ounce of dignity and credibility left. He should not do it for himself, but for the motorists of Ontario. Shape up. People are getting maimed here. People are frightened. This is no laughing matter. Those are real words, real people, real statistics.

In 1988, 23% of the buses inspected were detained for major defects—not brake lights. So there you go. When you see four buses on the highway, and the words are not too strong, there is one bus that should be taken out of there as soon as possible.

Miss Martel: There are kids on them.

Mr Pouliot: And children are in those buses. Imagine, Mr Speaker, children, toddlers in some cases, and the government does not care about inspecting. The government is not the sentry at its post. They do not care. They did two years before that, but they seem to have lost interest. God help them. It goes from bad to worse here. I cannot believe it. Yes, it is right here.

Back to trucks: Brampton and London—and I am concerned about the Premier of our province among other worthy citizens of London. I want to wish them well. I cannot help but be concerned for the welfare of our brothers and sisters and for the welfare of the Premier as well. He lives in London, and 28% of the trucks inspected in Brampton and London had to be taken off the highway, quick, quick, quick. That is 28%. The Premier should be careful when he drives. We want to wish him well. But 28% have defects that are so bad that the trucks should be removed from the highway and have been removed.

These are tell-tale stats. Simply put, the following tells it all. The following will illustrate better than anything else how bad the situation is. We are not talking about a spot check here, we are not talking about a sample—Mr Speaker, your attention,

please. In the fiscal year of 1988, 26,000 trucks were inspected. How many of those trucks were unsafe, had major defects and were taken off the highway?

Interjection.

Mr Pouliot: Pardon me? Fourteen per cent? No, no, higher, Mr Speaker. Sixteen per cent, sir? Come on, you go to Alfred, you go to Prescott and Russell, you drive the highway. Twenty-two per cent of the 26,000 vehicles, almost one out of every four, were unsafe.

In all seriousness, the mechanical defect rate since 1975 has done only one thing: it has increased. This is a state of crisis. I have searched long and hard to believe the government when it tells us that Bill 96, which will allow longer trucks, will increase safety. I have to say that the government is incorrect, because there are massive data, statistics left and right by the Provincial Auditor, letters of concern by concerned citizens and townships, National Research Council, Canadian Automobile Association, railway unions, Transport 2000, Ontario Provincial Police, telling us that larger trucks will make a bad situation worse.

There is a mountain of evidence, numbers, statistics all over that are saying the minister cannot monitor compliance on what he has. He cannot police what he has now; he just cannot do it. How can he believe that? We wish we could believe him, but he has such a poor track record and so many people have died and suffered that he has very little credibility left. What the people are saying, furthermore, is, "Clean up your act and then come back with something that we can live with once you have achieved credibility."

Longer trucks, the component of safety, and what we have now is overloaded. Someone will say: "Mr Pouliot, they're not overloaded. We checked them on our scales." We know who works the night shift on the rigs, we know who works the weekend shift on the rigs, we know that that safety component is not being respected nearly as much as it should. We know what the penalty is if you get caught if you are overweight. You get your wrist slapped. If you have too much weight on your truck, you get your wrist slapped. You will pay a fine in the state of Rhode Island which is 200 times higher than the fine that will be imposed by the government of Ontario.

1600

Fear, and rightly so, is a motivator, is conducive to safety. The minister has to mean what he says. You cannot be charged \$56 for having a huge monster truck that is overloaded when all the states around you are charging 10 or 20 times, and in the case of Rhode Island 200 times more. Those people mean what they say, that if you overload your truck and you get caught doing so, you will be punished. I have heard it said that because of the low monitoring of compliance and also because if you get caught, it does not mean a thing, does not mean a great deal, it becomes an invitation to sin.

The boss tells the trucker: "Well, it doesn't matter if you are overweight. If you get caught, you just pay the \$56 or a paltry fine. Since you are overloaded by so many hundreds of pounds, we will sure make it up in freight charges." It is an invitation to sin. How are you going to get caught during the weekend at 3 o'clock in the morning? The weigh scales are closed. They know that. The word gets around, and should you get caught one more time, it does not matter.

The driver is at the mercy of the employer. What do you do? You do not wish to be driving in sin. You do not want to do this. You know what the law says. By the same token, if you do

not do it, the employer will get someone else to move it. That is the sad economic reality that we have. That is the world that we live in, a sad side of the world, if you wish. It is a wonderful world, but that is the way the world operates. That is being done and we know that it is being done.

We know that the Ministry of Transportation should come up with an amendment to the Highway Traffic Act and impose sanctions and penalties that are deterrents to what is taking place in the marketplace. Michigan does it. New York does it. Rhode Island does it. California does it. But Ontario does not want to do anything. It does not even want to come near. So people keep trucking and they keep contravening. Every time they do this, for every mile that they lobb, as soon as that vehicle is moving it causes anxiety. It is a bit more of a safety hazard.

We have talked about the impact, the deteriorating road conditions that all Ontarians are subjected to. Now with the advent of longer trucks, which will be heavier trucks for they will carry more weight, the impact will be more severe. We have already established that the impact on the road system, on our roads, of one large truck is equivalent to 10,000 cars.

David Bradley, the Ontario Trucking Association vice-president, is saying simply that we have had in Ontario a decade of neglect in addressing our roads, in resurfacing and reconstructing our roads. His figures say that the Ontario government extracts approximately \$1.8 billion a year in fees and fuel taxes. But what the government does not tell the public is that it only puts back \$1.4 billion. In other words, the hand that takes, takes more, is greedier than the hand that gives, the hand that addresses the road problems. The disparity is a full \$400 million. No wonder our roads are in such bad shape.

I think the minister ought to be ashamed of the performance of his government. Everyone likes good roads. He knows that. It is foolproof. Well, he should give them to people. They are paying dearly. They are the highest-taxed people in Canada, in the Dominion, the people of Ontario. They give the government everything.

In fact, it has been said, and this is relevant to Bill 96 because we are talking about the monetary aspect here, that we start working for ourselves in July. When the average Ontarian starts working in January, he gives everything to the government. In the second week of July, he starts working for himself because 52 cents of the dollar for the average Ontarian go into taxes and 11.1 cents a litre go into the pockets of the Minister of Revenue, the Honourable Remo. If you do not pay, the Honourable Remo Mancini, an excellent person—

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Revenue?

Mr Pouliot: The Minister of Revenue, the accomplice to the Treasurer. The minister says longer trucks are going to create jobs. What sad rhetoric indeed. I was representing, and I was honoured to do so, the opposition. When we talked about deregulation, Mr Speaker, as you will recall very clearly, we talked about deregulation for weeks on end at public hearings throughout the province and we were told the same line.

I want to go back to just before deregulation. When the Premier of Ontario said, "There will be no deal"—you have guessed it, Mr Speaker—he was talking about free trade. "That is the bottom line. There will be no deal. I, Premier David Peterson, will make sure that if these conditions are not met, the free trade deal will not take effect."

I was in Washington with the standing committee on public accounts. They had never heard—they had heard of a free deal somehow, a little—but they had never heard of the Premier and the threats and ultimatums that if those conditions were not

met, there would be no deal. Free trade came to pass and shortly after that, deregulation was put forward by the government. And do I ever recall the minister's predecessor, because we told him specifically what would happen. "With deregulation, we will be able to compete. No jobs will be lost. No jobs will be lost in the trucking industry. It will create jobs."

Since deregulation, 5,000 truckers in Ontario have lost their jobs. We told the minister so, and those words, prophetic at the time, are the sad reality of today: 5,000 jobs have been lost because of the government's perverseness. They were perverse to the point of being obstinate; they would not listen. They said we could compete, "We can do it, we are second to none," patted themselves on the back, refusing to see the reality in front of their very eyes. That number will escalate to 12,000 by the time the exercise of deregulation is fully consumed, for the playing field, and this was indicated, is not level. The game is not the same.

In the state of Kansas you can hire a truck driver and you can pay that person—he in most cases, she in some—\$7.50 an hour. They will bring some fringe benefits that are minimal, because, as a rule, we know that if you do not make that much money on an hourly basis, your fringe benefits are not very high either. But in Ontario you have to pay a minimum of \$16 an hour to get a qualified driver and you also have to pay for more benefits. The tax system in Ontario, as we know only too well, is altogether different. These are not incentives here. This is a deterrent, unless you are very fortunate.

But again, that is another story, and I want to stick with the bill; I want to talk about Bill 96. I for one will never take, I pledge, Mr Speaker, advantage of a forum, of a platform, and depart—well, for too long—from the subject matter being addressed, because under your leadership, your guidance and your counsel I have grown accustomed to the standing orders of this House, and I respect you for it. Again, I want to thank you for the opportunity to say a few more words about this ill-fated, ill-thought legislation.

Mr Laughren: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: There are a lot of other members who would like to hear the remainder of my colleague's speech, and since there is no quorum, we need to have more members in here for that to happen.

The Speaker: All right. I will ascertain if there is a quorum.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is not present.

The Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1613

The Speaker: A quorum is present. The member for Lake Nipigon may wish to continue his remarks.

Mr Pouliot: Thank you very kindly. Now that the House is "duly constituted," we can roll along here and keep conducting business.

Monsieur le Président, vous me permettez, bien sûr, de prononcer dans cette auguste Chambre quelques mots en français, pour simplement dire, parce que nous avons dans cette province 500 000 Franco-Ontariens et, tout aussi important dans le contexte du projet de loi 96, naturellement, que beaucoup de ces gens sont des automobilistes. Ce sont des gens comme vous et moi, Monsieur le Président, des gens qui ont oeuvré, des gens qui travaillent, des gens qui sont souvent des piliers de la société, oui, des gens comme tout le monde.

Dans le contexte du projet de loi 96, en 1990, aujourd'hui, maintenant, ce sont aussi des automobilistes qui se sentent un peu plus démunis. Ce sont des gens, aujourd'hui, qui en ont moins ; ce sont des gens, des Ontariens, des frères, des soeurs qui ont peur. Ce sont eux qui, en vertu du projet de loi 96, se voient un peu plus impuissants et se sentent souvent désarmés. Oui, bien sûr, eux aussi ont surveillé, comme nous l'avons tous fait, la performance du ministre des Transports, la sienne et celle de ses prédécesseurs. Ils continueront de le faire, ceux qui viendront après.

Ils nous ont dit que la performance du Ministre — parce qu'eux aussi veulent croire le Ministre — était moins que satisfaisante, que les centaines et les milliers de personnes qui ont perdu leur vie sur le réseau routier de l'Ontario, l'ont souvent perdu, pas toujours, à cause d'un manque de vigilance de la part du Ministère.

J'essaie d'être généreux ; moi aussi j'essaie de comprendre. Mais plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose, et plus c'est la même chose, moins ça change. Si au moins on avait la certitude, si au moins on pouvait croire qu'un jour, bientôt, dans le futur immédiat, ce même gouvernement mettrait en oeuvre des mesures qui assureraient que les automobilistes, les gens qui voyagent sur nos routes, le feraient en plus avec plus de sécurité.

C'est là la clé. Ce que nous voulons, individuellement et collectivement, c'est croire que demain sera meilleur. Mais le gouvernement, à cause de ses bêtises continues, parce qu'il s'obstine, parce qu'il s'entête à présenter en Chambre des mesures qui non seulement ne sont pas populaires, mais auxquelles la société ne devrait pas être assujettie — C'est le Ministre qui est le coupable ; c'est le Ministre qui, avec une signature, peut remettre en question cet important problème parce qu'ici c'est la question primordiale : celle de la sécurité routière des Ontariens.

Jobs will be lost. We have already lost 5,000 because the playing field is not level. For instance, I hear a person in Kansas will accept to drive a truck, will say, "Yes, I will drive one for \$7.50," versus more than twice as much in the province of Ontario.

I do not have to tell you about the price of gas, Mr Speaker. Remember the old days when you drove your car and you yourself stopped at the pump to pick up some gas? Some of us worked at the pump during our spare time, for we were not all that rich. It came after the paper route. You had to be a couple of years older. The price of gas is an atrocity, so how can you compete? Everyone knows. It is not a secret. People are trying to be patriotic when price and quality comparisons do not keep us working in Canada and Ontario.

Ironically, the minister comes from a border town. He is not too far from the US border.

Mr McLean: He only worked there.

Mr Pouliot: Oh, he must know people very close to him who will cross over the bridge and tank up in the US. He must know some of his constituents who get a better deal. It is normal. You save \$10 or \$12; you do not get gouged. Ironically, it is Canadian gas. It costs you about \$10 or \$12 every time you tank up on the other side, in the United States. How do you like those figures? Come on, the minister should get serious. How can he when he has the right to legislate and he is doing that to people?

The truckers do the same. Now we are into wages. We have already acquiesced that it is cheaper. Those big rigs—and the minister is going to make them bigger—do not run on water;

they run on gas or on fuel. So there is no comparison. Again—does the minister know what I am saying?—the insurance companies there do not operate on the same scale. They deal with a larger market. So we are less competitive. The playing field is not level. It is not even this way; it is this way, and you are down here, buddy—pardon me, Mr Speaker, the minister is down here—and you are trying to go uphill. You will not get a chance to jackknife; you are going straight downhill. You will not make it.

So jobs are being lost all the time. When competition in the marketplace is no longer the order of the day, when that vital element of the free enterprise system has been removed because to top it all the minister subjects us to takeovers and mergers, we have nothing left to compete. So we go from losing 5,000 jobs in the past 18 months in the trucking industry in Ontario, and mark my words—hopefully, I am wrong—12,000 Ontarians will have lost their jobs in trucking in another 12 months; a grand total of 12,000.

Longer trucks—he wants to make it worse. That person there, who is responsible, wants to make it worse. He knows it is less safe. It is going to create mayhem—more so—it is going to create havoc, a large degree of uncertainty, but he persists. He serves his masters well.

1620

I do not want to impute motive—it is not my style—but why would a person do this? What happened to him? Was it a full moon? When did he turn? Four months ago, the Minister of Transportation said: “I am against longer trucks because it’s a safety hazard. They’re not safe.” Now he just flip-flops, and this is what makes this exercise so difficult. For no apparent reason, he said, “I’ve been converted. Someone came to me.” What it was, I do not know. Again, was it a full moon? Who got to the minister?

Well, certainly not the Canadian Automobile Association, certainly not consumers’ advocates, certainly not the general public, certainly not the Ontario Provincial Police, certainly not Transport 2000, certainly not renowned people in their specific fields of expertise—have I missed any?

Oh, I know, I know, I have to know: People who make trucks—I should have known that—people who make trucks got to him. That is the only one left. I have named everybody else, who is scared stiff. Truck companies, the American lobbyists—remember, from the vulgar trade to an honourable profession?—the minister must have thought when he met those fine people, who do not have his best interests at heart—they can dispense—he must have thought he was meeting his best friend every five minutes.

Some people have difficulties with relationships. If someone appears as a friend, well, my God, if the minister says “Good morning, how are you?” to someone and the person says, “More important, Minister, how are you?” he becomes the main person, the convenience. They are selling trucks and they are making trucks or they are driving them in the United States—“Remember, you can’t compete.”

If you cannot compete under your present circumstances, and 12,000 people are deprived of the opportunity and the right to put food on the table by virtue of the minister’s legislation, how bad will it get with longer trucks? Then the playing field is this way, my friend. Technically, the minister has been in the horizontal. He should get his brains to function, with respect. Do things for the people. Leave a legacy. Give us a chance to be like the others, give us a chance to live.

By way of conclusion—and I could spend hours—we have literally books and books and books of statistics, but it is like a wall there. You cannot seem to penetrate and it is very frustrating. So again, I am pleased that there will be public hearings. I am pleased that the foot soldiers will be able to tell the people on the committee, in the context of due process, that they have fear, fear that is a normal reaction, for the minister has not monitored compliance under the present system.

I want people from Transport 2000 and others. We will invite engineers, people who will speak, who will be relevant, who will talk about weight distribution. We want people from the ministry who will say: “No, we cannot monitor compliance on the weigh scales.” We want the motorists of Ontario to put a visage, to bring a human dimension as presenters. We want all those.

Then, if we listen, if we listen well, we will begin to understand that this bill is flawed. The timing for this bill is not right. More important, what is being done here is wrong.

Again, by way of a letter from the people of Terrace Bay speaking on behalf of others, add to it the concerns of “private citizens,” people who still believe that their voice will be heard. Across the street to Transport 2000 which has, with a great deal of research and expertise, meticulously addressed Bill 96 line by line and offered a positive alternative. Their voice was denied, was not heard.

The Canadian Automobile Association, the Ontario section, with its 1,300,000 people who are saying: “No, Minister, don’t do it. What you are doing here is wrong, minister. We represent motorists. We listen. They know.”

The Ontario Provincial Police, the foot soldiers, the crews who walk the beat, who are there, the front-liners who see it every day, are saying: “It’s our job. It’s our mandate. You are making a bad situation worse. End the carnage. Don’t make it worse.” The OPP is saying this. It is a litany. The list goes on and on: concerned citizens, experts, motorists, victims, potential victims—for we could be victims in waiting if this methodology, this approach, this style of the minister’s, is allowed to continue—people who have lost their jobs, lost their livelihood, lost their investment, more people who are waiting or trying to keep the sheriff or the wolf out of the door have to make a payment to the bank.

Yes, free trade, deregulation and now longer trucks; when will it stop? This government seems to be insatiable. It strikes with passion. It strikes with vengeance. It talks a good line, but it certainly does not listen very well.

I very much look forward to the opportunity in the standing committee on resources development, under the guidance and leadership of the member for Nickel Belt, of examining not only clause by clause, as I am sure will come later, but to listen to and learn from presenters come time for public hearings.

Mr Wiseman: I am pleased to get up and take part in this debate on Bill 96. I was a little concerned that the minister, shortly after he took the portfolio over in October, went to the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto and told it that he had some great concerns about what my friend the member for Lake Nipigon has just said, and what I hope to say over the next few minutes, about safety and concerns for safety.

I tend to agree with what he said at that particular time, knowing what had happened with the previous deregulation bill dealing with safety and many of the things that we told his predecessor. Now we have seen in the last few months, or few weeks actually, the Ontario Trucking Association and others bringing forward and saying again in a different way what we said back then. I think we have to be very careful with this bill,

that we do not have the same thing happen that happened back with those two bills.

I have known the member ever since he came to the Legislature and I think maybe this afternoon, or some time later, he may tell us why he changed his mind in less than a month and was saying, on 23 November in a speech to the Ontario Trucking Association, that he had changed his mind and was going to bring through the legislation to bring in longer trucks. I have not heard anything in his opening statement here today that would lead me to believe that there had been a great change or that he had heard a lot about an increase in safety. Perhaps we will get a clarification of that as we go on.

He did mention a few things on why he supports the bill. Some of those things were brought out by the member for Lake Nipigon. I found it interesting how you can have longer trucks on the highway that actually weigh less, unless they are carrying corn flakes, potato chips or things of that sort. They do not all do that because we did hear the minister say that he anticipates there will be fewer trucks on the road, and if you take some of the loads we presently see, they are not all potato chips or cornflakes or whatever. Some of them are going to have to carry much larger, heavier loads.

1630

Mr Kerrio: More wheels, Doug, more wheels.

Mr Wiseman: Yes, thanks.

He mentioned too that the wear and tear on the roads would be less because of fewer trucks. I am sure the minister is well aware of the Michigan report that came out that said maintenance on the roads had increased greatly when they moved to the 53-foot from the 48-foot trailers, and that in most cases the asphalt wore out 20% faster than with the 48-foot truck.

We know that right now the minister finds it difficult to find money for resurfacing roads. Where we used to get probably 20 years out of a highway before it had to be resurfaced, now that time, because of the increased traffic load and one thing and another, is more like 15 years, and in some cases less than that. So it is going to be a greater cost to the Ontario taxpayers if the minister is going to even try to keep the roads up to the standards we presently have, and maybe not even the standards we were used to a few years ago when a certain Tory party was in power.

Having driven into Toronto on Highway 401—I know most members do that on a regular basis and know the problems. Again, the member for Lake Nipigon read some examples from some of his people. I could do that, but I am not going to do it here this afternoon. Rather, I will try to tell the minister and those gathered here that there are a lot of individuals like myself who have a lot of concern about the trucks on our highways, even the way they are today. It is a devil coming up—the member for Kingston and The Islands will know if he drives, and I know he does, that on a wet day or a snowy day, if you try to go by a couple of these trucks that seem to travel in a convoy, it is almost impossible to get by them, especially with the snow or the rain. It is just like trying to drive your car at 100 kilometres an hour or so through a coin wash; you know how that water comes at you.

I do not know about the rest of the members, but I usually speed up a bit and try to get by the devil as fast as I can because with the wind, the rain and everything, you really do not have much vision. You just watch that shoulder of the road and get by him.

The minister had mentioned too, and the member for Lake Nipigon brought it up—I think I touched on it earlier—about

there being fewer trucks on the road when you get longer trucks and yet you would not have any more weight on there. It is pretty hard to imagine. When the minister reads that later, I think he will maybe correct himself on what he said, because you cannot have it both ways—you cannot have longer trucks and fewer trucks on the road and not carry more goods in them in order to do that.

The Ontario Trucking Association—it is interesting—up until two years ago was opposed to the regulation to bring in 53-foot trailers, and now I understand it is still not supporting this; there is still dissension in the ranks. One would think it should have at least the blessing of the Ontario Trucking Association that it feels this is a good piece of legislation. As I say, one would think they would be supporting it wholeheartedly, but I understand, if my information is correct, that they are not.

An awful lot of people who have talked to me about this bill and who have written in have wondered in this day and age—we have heard the Minister of Transportation stand up and mention the federal government and the cutbacks at Via Rail and so on, yet by bringing in legislation like this, I believe that CP and CN, which are able to carry a lot of trailers on flatcars, may see a decrease in business because of these extra-length trucks.

Many people are saying: “You have the railroad bed there. You have a way of getting it across. It is fast. Why do you not use it and get them off the roads?” I think this will be a deterrent to a lot of users of CP Rail and CN in this manner. I hope it is not, but I think it will cut into their business. I for one believe, like the people I represent, that as much as possible, more and more should be taken on those flatbeds and got them off the highways so us poor devils who have to drive 200 or 300 miles every week back and forth do not have to put up with an increase in trucks.

Also I understand, especially on two lanes, that the back ends of the 53-foot trucks have a tendency to wander, around a corner, cutting over into the oncoming traffic's side. I do not know but probably every member of the Legislature has had an occasion when, even with a 48-foot truck, you have had to back up at an intersection, and I mean back up maybe two or three car lengths in order to let him go around, at the present time. Imagine if you have five or six more feet to contend with. A lot of people just sit there and make the poor devil get up on the curb or whatever in order to get around. They do not realize that they should try to back up and let him do that. This happens in small towns and I imagine it happens in the city as well when they come up to a stoplight and try to make the turn.

Also with the longer trucks, and this is going back to the Michigan report again, they claim—again safety—that with the longer trucks, the smaller cars have a tendency in a rear-end collision to run underneath them and the driver is decapitated. They understand that has happened quite a few times. Anyone who has ever seen an accident like that, as I have—it would turn your stomach. Anything to avoid that would be a great improvement.

I believe I mentioned before the higher costs of maintaining our highways. This again is in the Michigan report. It is done after some experience, and this is why I say we should learn from other people's experience and not find ourselves in the position we did with the previous two bills of thinking we had all the answers and now we find that maybe the government should have listened to the opposition, to the truckers, and they would not be in the position they are in today.

The minister mentioned that there would be fewer emissions into the environment and less fuel consumption, but in the

Michigan report, again, it was the opposite. They found there were more emissions going into the environment and more fuel costs. It just does not bear out what the minister has said.

1640

There are a lot of articles here. I will not read them all, but there is one that really alarmed me. Having a large dump truck on the farm and knowing that this year when my son got it out the other day the brakes were not so good, we took it in and had it looked after. This is an article by Andrew Duffy of the *Toronto Star*. The headline is, "40% of Trucks on the Road are Defective, OPP Say." This was said not by Doug Wiseman or the PC party, but by the OPP.

I will not read the whole thing, but it says: "At roadside checkpoints OPP officers have found that up to 40% of trucks need mechanical repairs. The majority of defects involve the brake systems, said OPP superintendent Bill Closs.

"More than one in four gravel trucks were found to be overloaded, he added. 'It's a potentially dangerous situation, especially when the two factors are combined.' A mechanically sound tractor-trailer moving at 100 kilometres (62 miles) an hour, takes about...153 yards to stop." The distance is greatly "increased when a truck is overloaded or its brakes are improperly adjusted," said Mr Closs, the superintendent.

"In a recent nine-day crackdown on commercial vehicles in the Metro area, the OPP handed out 83 fines relating to mechanical problems after stopping more than 200 vehicles."

The next two comments are quite interesting. One is from the president of the Ontario Trucking Association, who said he was concerned by the OPP figures: "'I wouldn't think it would be that high (40%),' said Raymond Cope. 'There shouldn't be any vehicles on the road in an unsafe operating condition.'"

The next one is the one that alarms me. "Wendall Gough, vice-president of maintenance of Kingsway Transports Ltd, said brake adjustment problems are common on large trucks, but do not pose a significant safety hazard." I do not know how he figures that. "Poor brake adjustments mean trucks might require an extra 30 to 40 feet...to come to a full stop." If you add that to the 153 yards to stop under normal conditions, that could mean a lot of accidents unnecessarily, in my estimation.

With this report by the OPP and the high percentage of trucks that it finds on the road now that are unsafe, I think it is really a slap in the face to us who passed the safety bill not much more than a year ago to still find that 40% of the trucks in this Metropolitan Toronto area are being driven with some kind of mechanical problems, with most of them related to unsafe braking mechanisms. As motorists, this does not make us feel very secure when we are travelling our highways.

I will not repeat a lot of what the member for Lake Nipigon has gone into, other than to say that we are all for a level playing field for the trucking association. We said that when the first two bills were going through, but we want to make sure that safety is in there and that the motorists have a part to play in it as well.

We have heard from the Canadian Automobile Association, the Hamilton Automobile Association, numerous Ontario municipalities, CN and CP Rail, and as I mentioned before, a lot of private individuals who have to travel for business or pleasure on our highways and want to make sure that this extra length we are talking about here today in this bill will be safe.

That is why I am interested in giving the people of Ontario and anyone who is interested in this bill who travels our highways an opportunity, hopefully this summer when we go out to committee, to come in and tell us what changes they would like

to see, whether they are for or against the bill. Hopefully the government will listen this time and not do as it did on the two previous bills—conduct all the hearings and go on and bring in bills that we have found now not to have given our truckers a level playing field, which we have heard so much about then and now—but would rather make sure that safety is foremost in our thoughts as we hold hearings on this particular bill. Hopefully, as I say, this minister will listen more than his predecessor did on recommendations that not just the opposition makes but the people who attend these meetings make.

The Speaker: Are there any comments or questions?

Mr McLean: I just want to compliment the member on his input into this bill. I am sure that when the public hearings are held across this province there will be a lot more input. The bill, with regard to the act regarding maximum allowable dimensions and weights for vehicles and combinations of vehicles is the part I took great notice of, because I thought I had an indication from the minister where he said that the weights would not be increased.

We see in the preamble that, yes, the "23 metres while on a highway" will be something new, and "if specified conditions are satisfied," and "Section 108 of the act is amended to authorize the making of regulations prescribing maximum allowable weights for classes of vehicles and combinations of vehicles and prescribing maximum allowable loadings on components of a vehicle."

When we look at the prescribed maximum allowable loadings, "Column 2 of table 1 to part VII of the said act is amended by striking out '16,800' in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof '17,000';" So there is in fact an increased weight. I just want to draw that to the attention of the minister, because I feel very strongly when I am listening to the remarks from the members, from the member for Lanark-Renfrew, that there will be an increase in weight. I am waiting to see when the minister replies to some of the comments that have been made if perhaps he will be directing his comments to that. I know that when there are public hearings held across the province there will be a great concern and input into the bill so that it is right for all the people of the province.

1650

The Deputy Speaker: Other questions and comments on the member's statement? If not, would the member for Lanark-Renfrew wish to respond? No response? Fair enough. Do other members wish to participate in the debate? I see the member for Nickel Belt rising.

Mr Laughren: Yes, you do indeed, Mr Speaker. I wanted to say a few words. I was not originally intending to speak on this bill this afternoon, but the opening remarks of the minister have provoked me.

We know that once the bill has completed second reading stage it is then going to go to committee hearings, and I understand that is going to be the standing committee on resources development, of which I am a member. I look forward to those hearings. I hope the minister and the government members understand the amount of concern that there is out there in the community across the province about this bill. Whether they are right or whether they are wrong remains to be seen, but there is a lot of concern out there and I suspect there are going to be a lot more organizations and persons who wish to make presentation to the committee than some of the government members seem to appreciate.

I think that is something we are going to have to keep in mind as we make arrangements for the committee hearings, just how widespread the concern is. Perhaps it is not as wide as I think it is, but if the mail that I get and the comments I hear are any indication, then there is a lot of concern. There is a lot of concern in particular in northern Ontario, but I suspect it is not restricted to northern Ontario. But I can tell members there is particular concern in the north and I would like to make a few remarks concerning that in a few minutes.

The minister sounds very reassuring in his opening comments, that the larger trucks will be better for the environment, that the larger trucks are going to be safer, that the larger trucks will not be heavier on our highways. I do not think I am misquoting him in any sense. It is hard to understand how you can go from a truck that is 48 feet, I believe it is, to a truck that is 53 feet and not have more weight. I know, I understand that the minister is saying he is not going to increase the weight limit, the maximum weight limit or load on the truck, but that does not mean that people who are not at the maximum will not be putting more weight in those larger trucks. Why would they not, for heaven's sake? To say that there is not going to be any more weight on the trucks does not make sense if the people are going to put more in the truck even though it is—

Hon Mr Wrye: It's going to be less.

Mr Laughren: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin says there are more axles, the member said? Perhaps I misheard him.

Hon Mr Wrye: It should be 20% less.

Mr Laughren: Okay, the minister is saying there is going to be 20% less weight. I am really looking forward to this debate in committee as we debate the realism—perhaps it is surrealism—of having bigger trucks that weigh less. I really look forward to that debate.

On the matter of being environmentally friendly, I am not sure how the minister comes to that conclusion either, unless he thinks there are going to be fewer and lighter trucks out there, which will be safer and environmentally friendly; I see.

Hon Mr Wrye: You've got it.

Mr Laughren: I have finally got the message that the minister is trying to sell across Ontario. He has not convinced me. For me, the jury is still out on that, and I suppose under free trade I am supposed to say, "I'm from Missouri," but I am really not convinced that the minister is correct when he says that the larger trucks will be safer and lighter. I find that very difficult to believe. However, we shall see what the experts say when they come before the committee.

I know that the minister understands we are going to expect some answers to some very specific questions and concerns that have been put by some very legitimate organizations out there across the province. These people do not have a political axe to grind. They do not have a political agenda, as it were, which the minister can always accuse the opposition of having, of course, and since he spent so long in opposition, he knows that that sometimes does occur. But the minister should know that these groups that are opposed to these larger trucks have a lot of credibility out there in the community.

I will give an example. The CAA member, Hamilton Automobile Club, has written to all members, I believe. At least a copy of the letter to the minister has gone to all members. According to them, the people who are in total opposition to this bill are the following, and I am sure there are others: the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Ontario Provincial Police, the Ontario Good Roads Association, Canadian National

Railways, medical practitioners, the Municipal Engineers Association, the Council on Road Trauma, the Teamsters, Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters Association, known affectionately as NOTO, Transport 2000 and the Ontario Traffic Conference.

That is a pretty impressive array of organizations lined up against this bill. I am not sure if the minister has pacified all those groups or got them to the point where they will support the bill. If the minister has accomplished that, they have not in turn passed that on to me.

And if you think about it, all of those groups have something to do with our roads or with safety on the roads and you can understand their concern, so I will be looking forward to hearing in the minister's response to this second reading debate how he deals with all those organizations, and second, I look forward, of course, and hope very much that those organizations will come before the resources committee when the public hearings are held, whenever that might be. I hope very much that those organizations will make sure that they get their requests in to the committee to be heard, because they have expressed these views and I think it is safe to say that all members of the Legislature, when they receive this correspondence, must stop and think for a moment that if these organizations are opposed to this bill, then what is wrong? Why would we support a bill when all of those organizations are opposed to it?

The Hamilton Automobile Club, which obviously has done a lot of work, and I commend it for the work it has done on this bill, says in a letter to the minister dated 15 December 1989, some six months ago or so, the following. They are talking about the issue of larger trucks.

"The suggestion that this will permit the Ontario trucking industry to be competitive in a free trade environment is simply too weak a rationale to justify this action."

If I could divert from the text of the letter for a moment, I assume this means that the Minister of Transportation, in response to their concerns, argued that this was necessary under the free trade agreement in order to allow the Ontario trucking industry to compete with its American competitors. Why else would the association say, "The suggestion"—presumably from the minister—"that this will permit the Ontario trucking industry to be competitive in a free trade environment is simply too weak a rationale to justify this action"?

It is very interesting that the minister is going across this province blaming this kind of legislation on the free trade agreement, even though his government did absolutely nothing, or to use the language of the street these days, did diddly-squat about the free trade agreement when it had an opportunity to do so, absolutely nothing.

Hon Mr Wrye: We were waiting for Ed.

Mr Laughren: Well, this party was in power, whereas other parties were not, I should remind the minister.

I go back to the letter from the Hamilton Automobile Club.

"The fact is the Ontario trucking industry is one of the strongest and healthiest industries in Canada and stronger than many state trucking organizations. We"—in Ontario—"have over 46 trucks per kilometre of provincial highway compared to the average across Canada of just over 13 and Quebec at 7.7. Consequently, the current truck limits have not inhibited the development of a strong trucking industry in Ontario."

"Furthermore, we believe it is imperative for your government to rationalize the transportation of goods in Ontario by encouraging an intermodal method of transportation, eg, trailers that have both rail wheels and tires so they can be transported on rails for a distance and taken off at distribution points and to

their destinations by tractors. There are many other variations that would allow us to provide for the essential movement of goods in Ontario without having our highways pounded with heavy trucks as well as making a significant contribution to traffic accidents. We have already informed you of the costs on the Los Angeles freeway of truck accidents, estimated at \$190 million a year. That's the economic side. The other side, of course, is your desire to reduce traffic injuries and fatalities on Ontario highways, and yet this action will unquestionably contribute to an increase."

That is the view of the Hamilton Automobile Club in what I think is a very thoughtful contribution to the debate.

If the minister is so convinced that this legislation and these longer trucks are going to make matters safer and that is absolutely essential to the competitive health of the industry, I hope he will clarify that when he winds up on this second reading debate.

1700

It is not just the opposition or the Hamilton Automobile Club that is concerned. The minister will know that there was a commission. The Uffen commission did a report, and this is from the Hamilton Automobile Club again:

"On the Uffen commission, we had truckers, myself representing the motorists, police, a truck driver training school representative, a medical doctor and others representing various disciplines, including the government. I should add the Teamsters were also represented. The Teamsters, from the standpoint of their members' safety, were opposed to increases in truck lengths. The police were opposed to it from the standpoint of critical accidents on our highways and safety; the medical representative, Dr Green, was opposed to it because he had to deal with the trauma from such accidents. All these agencies are still opposed to any increase in truck lengths....Municipal engineers who appeared at the Uffen hearings pointed out that even with 21-metre lengths permitted on urban streets, they contributed substantially to congestion, road damage and difficulties in moving traffic. Adding four more metres to that original 21 metres will pose serious problems for urban areas."

I could go on, but I think the point is made that even the commission that was struck to look at this matter was opposed to it, and yet—

Interjection.

Mr Laughren: Well, I have just read a quote from that commission.

I said to the minister that I would make a few comments about northern concerns, and I can tell the minister it is a major concern in the north. We do not have the kind of four-lane, six-lane, 16-lane highways in northern Ontario that there are down here, and I can tell the minister that on all those two-lane highways across the north, the thought of these supertrucks is very worrisome.

Just this past weekend, I was driving from Timmins to Sudbury on Highway 144. It was raining and the southbound lane had almost like ruts in the pavement and they were filled with water. The northbound lane had no such ruts, and I concluded that the reason for that had to be that the trucks on Highway 144 are loaded with heavy timber going south and empty going north. Even trucks with that kind of weight on them were causing indentations in the pavement on Highway 144. I think the proof is there, because the indentations were in the southbound lane but not in the northbound lane. I can imagine what is going

to happen as we get into ever-larger trucks in the province of Ontario. Also, of course, roads like Highway 144 are narrower than roads in southern Ontario and that poses a problem with large trucks as well.

In the Sudbury basin—the member for Sudbury is not here at the moment—there is a very real concern about trucks in general, because the mining companies recently switched from transporting some of their ore in slurry, as it is known, in the Sudbury basin from rail to truck and we have a lot of these slurry trucks, all on the road in the congested, builtup areas of the Sudbury basin.

The amount of resistance by people in the Sudbury area is truly remarkable. They have had special committees struck by the region to look into the problem. I have written to the Minister of Transportation myself, suggesting that a committee of this Legislature should look at the whole matter of trucking in Ontario, both with safety and in terms of the cost. Who is paying their fair share? Is the trucking industry paying its fair share towards the cost of road maintenance and the building of roads? I am not sure they are. I think there needs to be a look at that.

This bill does not allow us to do that, of course. This bill deals specifically with other matters. I hope the minister does not think that because this bill is going out to committee, that resolves the problem that I think needs to be dealt with, and that is a committee of the Legislature to look specifically at the problems of trucking in the province of Ontario.

I wish the Minister of Northern Development were here. Perhaps he could tell us what his plans are for the shipping of garbage in large trucks to northern Ontario as well, because he certainly left that open for speculation this afternoon during question period.

When I think of all the options this minister had for improving safety on our highways, for improving the lot of motorists in Ontario, he had a large array of options, such as four-laning of highways, to give one example, building of more passing lanes, repaving existing bad roads. The minister had those options and he chose to put larger trucks on the road. It is a strange preference on behalf of the driving public in the province.

I think there is some problem in the perception of people all across Ontario about these larger trucks, and the minister is going to have a hard time explaining a couple of things. First, what caused him to change his mind over the longer trucks? One minute he is opposed to it on the record and the next minute he is in favour of it and out there flailing away, selling it as hard as he knows how.

Mr Mackenzie: Just days apart.

Mr Laughren: Days apart, as my colleague the member for Hamilton East says.

That has raised a lot of suspicions in a lot of people's minds about what it is that made the minister change his mind. Presumably when he was opposed to it, he did so on the basis of advice from his officials. One would hope he did not just dream that up all by himself. Then he changed his mind. Did his officials change their minds and did they in turn change his? Or did the industry change its mind and his mind, or just his mind? I know we do not expect his officials to come out and say, "No, the minister had a change of heart and we have no idea why." I do not expect them to say that. They have their job to do. That is one of the questions the minister is going to have to answer. I imagine he is going to hear it again and again, what caused him

to change his mind, because he has raised a lot of questions in a lot of people's minds.

Of course, the other question is how the minister expects to sell the idea that larger trucks mean less weight. He is going to have to convince a lot of people of that when he has not lowered the maximum limits. I do not know how he is going to sell that idea out there. I hope he is not going to use the argument that it is distributed over a different number of axles or something like that. The point is we are talking about the weight that is on the pavement on our highways. Accidents are important.

I am disappointed that the minister has brought forth this legislation. I think it is bad legislation. I do not believe the minister has allayed anybody's fears about safety or all the fears about what bigger trucks will do to our roads in the province. I do look forward to the public hearings process and to hearing what groups out there say and whether or not they have been convinced by the minister that their fears are unfounded. I look forward very much to the public hearings part of this entire process.

Mr Cousens: This is one of those bills where the government knows that it has 94 seats and the backbenchers really do not even have to think about it. The minister will make an announcement and then look around and there will be full support from the government. It almost means that by having this bill considered today and then moved out to committee, are we really going to impact it? There is a certain inevitability to what has gone on and how it has gone on. Notwithstanding that, there may well be some benefit to just discussing and debating this issue so that the government is apprised of both sides of the issue.

I think the government has to really be aware of the fact that longer trucks have certain benefits—and I think that has been recognized in the statements that have been made by the minister—but also, certain alarming problems come out of it as well when you think of the number of different groups that have already spoken out against longer trucks.

I think the most important person who has talked out about longer trucks is that anonymous, quiet-spoken, complaisant Canadian, the Ontario driver who is out on the highway driving a smaller vehicle. The cars we are driving are getting smaller and smaller, and now with this proposal by the government, the trucks that are on the roads are getting bigger and bigger. It is a funny contradiction. On the one hand, we see conservation affecting the way cars are being built. We are seeing more and more people, I hope, trying to conserve gasoline and energy, and certainly the material that goes into the construction of vehicles. Friends I know are driving compacts and subcompacts. Those little vehicles really do not have an awful lot to protect them from the big, giant vehicles that are on the roads and highways. That, to me, is what we have to take into balance.

All I really feel deep down is that the driver of that smaller vehicle has just more and more intimidation that is going to be upon him by virtue of the size of these bigger vehicles. You try to pass them. You are in a position where the splash and just the danger of getting into it, trying to get the car revved up to pass those trucks, is another situation.

1710

I know I have two young people in my own family, both with their own cars, not the bigger cars. I wish they had more steel and tin around them. From these large, giant machines that are coming on the roads they would have even less protection

than I would want them to have, less than what was necessary years ago. I guess to me it raises a whole series of questions, the question that says: "Why are municipalities in Ontario opposing this bill? Why is it that some of the other associations—the Canadian Automobile Association, the Hamilton Automobile Club, CN Rail, CP Rail—opposing this legislation?" I think one of the reasons that the rail companies would be opposing it has to be rather obvious. There is a certain conflict of interest there where they are saying, "Well, this could take business away from railroads."

Mr Callahan: There are not any railroads any more.

Mr Cousens: My honourable friend says there are not any railroads. I hope there are. Maybe they just do not go into his community and do what they want. I know that the GO train in my community is not doing enough, and I really believe in railroads. Anything we can do to support commuter services and the railroads—I think it is an excellent way of transportation. But we could get into another speech just on railroads. I happen to think that we have an opportunity to use the St Lawrence Seaway for transferring large bulk of steel and grain and other services. We have the railways for certain services. We need the trucking industry. All of them are part of the transportation services we have. Certainly air has come in in a new way.

I have problems with this bill, and yet I have to believe that anything I say or do now is not going to have a significant impact on what the future is going to do for Ontario. But if in fact we are able to have the minister understand some of the ramifications of bringing forward a bill that is going to lengthen the size of trailers and trucks, that in itself will mean that an already sensitive man will be even more sensitized to this issue.

I have to say that. Having been in a position to criticize the Minister of Transportation, I find him a very easy person to work with. I also respect him as a fellow colleague in the Legislature. Therefore, one has to separate personal enjoyment of a human being from the issue which I am really trying to deal with. I just do not like the way it was handled when in fact the minister, when he made the announcement on 23 November to the Ontario Trucking Association that he was "prepared to endorse a 25-metre overall length for tractor trailers and a new 53-foot trailer length. These new standards will of course require legislative amendments, which I plan on taking forward early in the next session this spring." I just wish that when the minister has significant announcements like that, he would bring them into the Legislature and use this as the forum for discussing it. He chose not to. In that way it gave an excuse for the manufacturers of trailers suddenly to say, "Look, we're going to want to build them."

I started having my phone ring in December saying, "Are you going to allow the legislation to go through quickly?" because I, with the support of the member for Lanark-Renfrew, who is really the Transportation critic, was involved with the issue. The legislation was not even drafted at that point. The legislation did not come into the House until 13 December. There was little likelihood that we would have anything more than first reading at that point, and second reading—as we know now, the government likes to ramrod everything through very quickly. It just cannot happen that way. We are dealing with a sensitive issue that deals with a very important subject the people in Ontario really would not want to just see happen by edict out of the cabinet of the David Peterson government.

I had the manufacturers of trailers saying: "Look, we've got the announcement from Minister Wrye saying that we're going

to have longer vehicles. Will you pass the legislation quickly so that we can change the orders that we have in? We've got people now ordering these longer trailers and we would like to be able to get them going. If the legislation is passed, then we can get them on the road. In the meantime, people are cancelling their orders for the regular-size trailer length. What will you do to speed it up?"

I could not do a thing to speed it up, because the legislation at that point had not even had first reading. Now that it has had first reading and we are into second reading, I am sure the government has had more of a negative impact on truckers in the transportation industry because of their waiting for this bill to be passed.

Unless the government comes along with some significant amendment, not much is going to stop this bill from being approved in the Legislature. Therefore, the kind of opposition that our party is giving is not going to be enough to really block it, but it may well be sufficient to make the government be a little bit more sensitive in the future as to how it brings in bills, how it announces them and how in fact they are going to impact the whole of the province of Ontario.

It worries me. I come back to my number one issue, which is, the cars are getting smaller and the trucks are getting bigger. That has to be one of the fundamental concerns I have as a driver on our highways and road systems. It is just that much more intimidating for the driver to be following, passing, be passed or be near those large vehicles.

In Michigan there has been a certain amount of study that has gone on about these trucks. It is funny how the Michigan example keeps coming up in this Legislature. It came up with the limited no-fault insurance because the model that has been used by the Liberals in Ontario happens to be the Michigan model of limited no-fault. Here again, it is Michigan that has the same kind of situation with the longer trucks.

Their report concluded: "Operated with the tandem axles in the full rearward position, the larger offtracking of the 53-foot semitrailers is incompatible with the geometry of many intersections in Michigan." By being incompatible with the geometry of many intersections, it means that those large trucks, when they are making a turn in some of the smaller communities, have a harder time turning. There are blind spots created; they go into the other lanes in order to make the turn. Let's face it: That in itself not only becomes an obstacle, but it becomes a safety concern.

Another point was made as it affects smaller municipalities, the smaller roads and the two-lane systems that we are into: "When loaded to its full-volume capacity, the 53-foot semitrailer is expected to experience a slightly higher rollover frequency." That means when it is fully filled up the chance of those larger vehicles tipping increases. That is part of the worry that I have now in Ontario, even on Highway 401 and the number of accidents we have had.

I think the accidents are not caused as much by the truckers as they are by drivers on the road system who really do not show the courtesy to those trucks as they should. The drivers are trying to make the best time they can, and the small car dives in and out and ducks around. Then those trucks, in order to save them, do a quick turn and in the process jeopardize themselves, their cargo, their trucks and other people on the highways. That happened in Kingston just a few weeks ago when a large tractor-trailer truck had to change lanes and lives were lost. It is going to happen, but I think we have to build as much of the safety controls into trucking and truck driving as

we possibly can. It starts with the truck driver, it starts with the truck, and it also goes with the people who are driving cars.

I am worried about the way our own drivers on the roads are reacting to those big vehicles. One of the things we have to do when looking at safety, and we are specifically talking about the much longer trucks that are going to be on the road, is introduce better methods of teaching our own drivers in Ontario to be conscious of safety standards. Maybe we should do more testing of drivers of all vehicles so that anyone who is on the road understands the rules and is going to be less likely to cause an accident, so that we all begin to think safety, so that we are driving more carefully, so that we are doing that kind of protective driving, the defensive driving that has become far more popular in recent years.

1720

It all comes together as a bundle where the Ministry of Transportation is looking at safety as a whole, entire, broader subject. They should not deal with things in isolation. There is a larger context. They should look at the safety of the small driver. Is his training up to par? Have we had him retested? Are the vehicles being maintained? That is part of the reason that the number of accidents exist on our highways, because of what is going on in the vehicle that is being driven by the person who is just driving a car.

None the less, I raise the points that come out of the Michigan study that point to the fact that there is a higher rollover rate, higher accident rate, that the bigger trucks are incompatible with the smaller roads within the Michigan communities.

The other thing that comes out of the Michigan study, which is another reason for asking why we have to do what everybody else around us is doing, is that all the northeastern United States are with the longer tractor-trailers, and I guess out west we are into the same situation. Does Quebec have the same as well? So Ontario is isolated unless it goes along with this.

That is the reason we are going to do it. That is the reason we will have the longer vehicles in Ontario, not because we have thought about it, considered it and looked at the evidence, but because everybody else around is doing it. Because they are doing it, it is therefore right.

That is not necessarily the way we should do business, yet I can see the economic sense of what is going to happen. That is why I say, not only do we have a Liberal majority, but there is a certain inevitability when everybody else around us is doing it. If everyone in Rome is doing it, then we should do it as well.

Notwithstanding that, the factor is that the damage to pavement, according to the Michigan study, will increase by a margin, not enough that I would be able to measure it, but they are certainly saying: "It is estimated that pavement damage will accrue at a rate which is approximately 20% higher when freight is transported in 53-foot semitrailers as opposed to 48-foot semitrailers."

That just means that that much more money has to go into the maintenance of our roads and our highways. I do not see this government putting the money out there. They are not doing it down in Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry. They are not coming along and putting more money into road maintenance. They are not doing it in Wellington. They are in all the Liberal ridings around the province, but certainly there is not enough money going into road construction, let alone road maintenance. In Markham I get the odd thing, but—

Hon Mr Wrye: Liberal ridings in Markham?

Mr Cousens: I just have to look after all the province of Ontario.

The fact of the matter is that I do not see the minister increasing his expenditure on road maintenance—

Hon Mr Wrye: How is regional road 16 coming?

Mr Cousens: —to help overcome the extra cost that is going to be waived by virtue of the higher cost to maintain this, that the roads will be more costly to maintain with the bigger trucks.

Hon Mr Wrye: How is the new Stouffville train?

Mr Cousens: I have a number of points that I could—now if the minister is going to start bribing me to come along and be more supportive of it, I want the Stouffville train, I want many highways, I want Highway 407, I want, I want, I want. I want it for our riding. I want it for the greater Toronto area. On that side of it, there is definitely the side that says we need certain things that are part of an infrastructure for a growing community. Why we need longer transport trailers right now, that has to do with some thinking that goes on in the minister's mind.

I would like to go on at greater length on this, but I know that there are other people who would like to participate in this debate. I just know that there is not universal support for this change that is being brought forward by the minister. I know that it is going to be more costly to maintain our roads. I know that it is challenging the drivers of small vehicles more by virtue of the size of the large trucks.

I think compact car owners tend to be very, very much worried about what is going to happen with rear-end collisions. There has been some study in Michigan and other places about decapitation because the height of the truck and the height of the car are such that people have lost their lives by virtue of the height being such that there was not any protection for them.

I just have to believe that when the ministry comes forward with a suggestion like this, there have to be ways in which the Legislature gets involved with it as well.

Just yesterday I received Partners in Safety from the Ontario Trucking Association. I am impressed at the way the truckers are really making an effort to educate every one of us with the need for safety. The fact of the matter is that people who are taking this program in now might well be interested in what the OTA is trying to do to educate people on preparing for a long trip, expressway driving, maintenance, braking, seatbelts, night driving, treating trucks with understanding. I think when we are going to have the longer trucks, we are going to have to learn how to keep to the left when behind a truck, how to do certain things. If people want to get a copy of this, I suggest they call a Toronto number: 416-249-7401.

Safety is the kind of thing that everybody has to be promoting. If there is any one reason why I am concerned about these longer vehicles, it has to be the safety consideration. When this goes to committee and there are public hearings on it, we hope then to hear the government give a defence of what it is suggesting and why it is making the trucks longer and what it is doing to encourage more safety on the roads.

I think a lot of it has to do with driver education, not just in trucks but also in vehicles and cars. I think it has to do with better maintenance on the roads, making sure that cars and vehicles are properly maintained as well. I think it calls for a whole understanding of what it is we want to have on our roads and how we are going to do it.

I sense that there seem to be more trucks on the road right now. I sense that the trucks are already pretty big, that there are

already an awful lot of accidents on the highway caused for a variety of reasons and that we are not doing enough to promote safety here in Ontario. If there is anything we can do to make the roads safer, then we must do it.

I challenge the Minister of Transportation to take this seriously. I challenge him not to be at the beck and call of the people who happen to want to have certain things. Let's have the balance that takes into consideration all the varied needs that are required in order to do the right thing.

I look forward to seeing this discussed in committee, at which time I know there will be considerable debate. I hope that the Legislature will not try to rush the committee process, but that there will be ample opportunity for those municipalities that are opposed, for those other groups that are opposed to it, as well as for those that are in favour, to come forward and give us their perspective on why they believe that Bill 96, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, is a good thing or a bad thing.

Unlike so many other instances when we have gone to committee and they have just had all the hearings and all the presentations and then they just went and voted as a block without ever even thinking about all the things that they had heard presented, I hope that the Minister of Transportation will allow that kind of openness in thinking by his backbenchers. If that is the case, then this bill might well have certain amendments to it that will take into consideration the concerns that I am expressing that deal with the one thing, and that is safety.

I know that there is a chance for others to speak now and I pass the debate on to them.

Mr Mackenzie: I am pleased to rise in my place and speak in this particular debate. I want to make it clear also that I do not support the bill that the minister has brought forward.

I may have had a little bit of an advantage, I guess, in 1977 and 1978 in sitting on the select committee on highway safety. That not only did a bit of travelling around Ontario but also visited some jurisdictions in Europe at the time, and one of the issues that we discussed at some length was longer trucks on the highway.

I know that that particular committee unanimously, as near as I can remember now, the NDP members, the Liberal members and the government members decided, based on what I thought was pretty good evidence, and I do not see anything that has changed, that longer trucks on the road were not the way to go. Back at that time, 12 or 13 years ago, as my colleague just said, there were probably a lot less of the small cars and more of the larger cars on the road. Yet there was certainly a concern and fear of motorists travelling on our highways with the longer trucks.

1730

I do not know whether the minister has talked to a lot of individual drivers. I think, if you took a look at the number of cars on the road and the number of trucks on the road, you would find one hell of a lot more cars than there are trucks, even though Ontario is the leading province in Canada when it comes to the number and the number per kilometre of trucks that are on the road. We have something like 46 or 47 trucks. In the term of the measurement they use, I think the next highest province is British Columbia with 18 and the average for all of Canada is only 13. So we are way ahead of any other part of Canada in terms of the number of trucks that are already on the road.

As I said, I do not know whether the minister has talked to individual drivers, but I would be interested in knowing how many of the individual drivers have told him that they support

the idea of longer trucks on the road. I have talked to dozens at least, maybe not hundreds, but certainly dozens of people about this particular issue. I have been interested in it ever since we issued our report in the select committee on highway safety.

I have yet to find an ordinary car driver who says that he would agree with the longer trucks on the road or who does not express concern at driving on our highways today in Ontario with the number of trucks and the speed of the trucks, and particularly if you run into a nasty or a wet or a rainy day, the kind of splash you get, and if it happens to be wintertime and a bit of snow, it is even worse.

I do not think there is support among the populace, the car drivers in the province, who certainly outnumber the truckers by several times, for this kind of legislation. Even more than that, Mr Speaker, I am convinced that if you talked to the truckers themselves, certainly a large number of them and probably a majority of them would also tell you that they do not agree with the longer trucks. I am not talking about the major trucking companies and the owners of those trucking companies, but I am talking about the people who drive the rigs.

I know that the Teamsters local in my town, in Hamilton, voted and voted heavily to oppose longer trucks on the highway. I believe it was also a position of the provincial Teamsters. So the people that represent at least the organized truckers in this province are not in support of this legislation that the minister has before us. The only people I can see who are in support of it happen to be some of the major trucking concerns.

I suspect as well, from calls I have had and from talking to the Teamsters and from talking to the officials at the auto club, that many of the smaller trucking companies are not enamoured of this legislation for a variety of reasons. Many of them cannot afford the additional costs of going into the bigger units. Whatever kind of a living they are making, they are making it now on trucks up to the maximum size currently allowed or on the smaller trucks. So I am not sure you would find all of the industry in support of it.

I am simply suggesting to members of this House that there is a very small, narrow constituency that wants this legislation for a variety of reasons. I do not know why this government continually ignores the view and the voice and the concerns of a large number of people. They have done it on the Sunday shopping, regardless of the arguments that are made. They have done it on the workers' compensation. They have done it on health and safety. They certainly did it with the increase in sales taxes, which is a regressive form of taxes. Now they are doing it when it comes to the fear that people express, and it is very real, of a much larger number of larger units on the highways.

I think I heard a suggestion from my Conservative colleague that maybe it makes some sense because everyone else is doing it, and that is about the only argument you will really find in favour of it. I am not sure that is the case either, because there is nothing, with trucks up to the current level, that stops whatever competition our people can give, even in moving into the United States.

But if only the big boys can afford the larger units, which will be the case in Ontario, I am not sure that they have much of a leg up on any out-of-province or American trucking firms that already have the larger units that are shipping into this country. I suspect we are losers in that game.

It seems to me that where we have protected jobs, we have done it with some kind of content legislation or we have done it with regulations or rules that guarantee a certain standard on Ontario highways. We are still able to compete there. I do not think that is a valid argument.

I know that there have been some comments raised about the campaign of the Hamilton Automobile Club. I think it is an excellent one. It is not a new one; it is one it has conducted for a long time. That is their concern on behalf of their drivers, and there are a lot of people who belong to the Hamilton Automobile Club and the other automobile clubs in this province and this country. They have raised a number of arguments that I have not heard answered here, and I doubt very much quite frankly that the minister is going to answer them.

I will start with Facts About Longer Trucks. I suspect most members got this, but I think it is useful putting it on the record. The auto club sent out a sheet, Facts About Longer Trucks, and it makes the following points:

"Fact: Trucks, as a percentage of vehicle registrations in Ontario in 1987, was 17.9% and yet truck involvement in fatal accidents, as a per cent of total vehicles involved in fatal accidents, was 26.5%." That is a pretty devastating statistic, but it does not seem to have entered into the minister's calculations.

"Fact: Not all accidents are caused by the trucks but the consequences regardless of who causes them, are disastrous, with the motor vehicle driver and passengers coming out the losers." I think that is pretty obvious when we see where there are accidents with vehicles and trucks, and particularly the smaller vehicles. I am talking about passenger cars that are on our roads today.

"Fact: Ontario has the highest density of trucks per kilometre of provincial highway of any province in Canada. Ontario is 46.3 vehicles per kilometre with the closest province being BC at 14.9"—it is not even the 18 I thought it was—"and the average across Canada at 13.6. The industry is very healthy in Ontario even with the basic 23-metre truck lengths permitted.

"Fact: The Dr Uffen truck safety commission in 1983 was composed of eight advisers including the medical profession, the police, truckers, the motorists' representatives, the Teamsters and government officials. The Teamster representative along with all remaining advisers and the commissioner, except for the trucking representative, were opposed to any increase in truck lengths. The truck drivers are not to blame. It is a few large trucking companies that want this advantage. This will disadvantage the medium to small trucking companies as well."

I think that makes the point I was trying to make. Not only will you not find probably 95% of car drivers in this province happy with the longer trucks; you will not even find a majority of the drivers of the trucks in this province happy with or in support of the longer trucks. I go back to my point: It becomes a very narrow, very small constituency. I think my colleague from Nickel Belt is right that we have to ask why that has been able to carry today with this minister.

"Fact: In the Uffen commission we did recognize the need to improve the stability of tractor-trailer combinations and consequently approved an increase from 21 metres to 23 metres to encourage cab-behind-the-engine tractors versus cab-over-engine which were unstable.

"Fact: If the proposed metre increase is permitted to go in, it means we will have increased truck sizes in four years by four metres or 13 feet—a 20% increase. Just another step on the road to achieving the trucking industry's goal for the 120-foot-long monster trucks on our highways.

"Fact: Despite the contribution to our economy in terms of delivery of goods, the increased number of bigger trucks with diesel engines raises environmental concerns. According to a 1988 report of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, diesel vehicles which do not have to meet the

same stringent control for cars, contribute to air pollution, not only with nitrous oxides and sulphur compounds, but also with fine particles which can cause hereditary deficiencies and cancer. According to the OECD report, big trucks cause vibrations and they do cause early wear on our road surfaces and early failure of our bridges. The environmental cost of big trucks is very high in comparison with smaller commercial and private vehicles."

1740

I have not heard answers for any of these facts as outlined and sent out by the automobile club and, I believe, endorsed by the national club as well.

"Fact: More axles and wheels create more air turbulence and more splash and spray during bad weather and road conditions."

If I can digress for just a moment, I drove, partly for cost reasons and to bring some of my riding's delegates with me, out to Winnipeg for our recent convention. I drove back through the United States and we did hit some bad, snowy weather. It was in the wintertime, and I can tell members it was not a pleasant drive. The most unpleasant part of it, and this is just exactly the comment that is being passed out by ordinary citizens across this province, were the trucks on the highway and the splash, because we had some snow and we had some slush. I thought I was going to be relieved when I crossed the border at Sarnia, but on the stretch from Sarnia past London and into where we cut off at Brantford to come into Hamilton it was a nightmare. I do a lot of driving, as probably a lot of members in this House do. I drive better than 50,000 kilometres a year and I can tell members that was not a pleasant drive. I know my concern, my fear literally on that highway, and I know that is a concern that is shared by many drivers.

My dad still has his licence. At 84 or 85 he is taking the yearly test now. I do not know how long he will have it. At that age, he tends to drive a little more slowly which, I sometimes warn him, is not necessarily the safest way to drive. But I can tell members also that the trucks on the highway terrify him, and they terrify most older drivers. He happens to be driving now, for cost and upkeep reasons—he is on pensions now—a smaller car, as so many people are; and you have not got a chance in a smaller car. One of my sons drives a larger car, and why? Simply because he is terrified in the small car. He also does, like myself, an awful lot of driving when he has to deal with the large trucks on the busy highways, cutting across Ontario as he is.

I go back again, and I will do it several times before I finish: How many individual car owners, of which there are probably two or three million in this province, has the minister talked to on this issue? How many have told him they support this longer bill? How many of the truckers, driving the trucks that we want to put on the highway, the longer trucks, support this legislation? I will bet my bottom dollar that you will get down to a very small handful of the truckers and an even smaller group, but powerful in influence and with a lot of money obviously, the major trucking companies. I suspect if the government canvassed even the smaller trucking outfits, it would not find the support for this legislation. Once again, it begs the question of why the minister has done this about-face on this particular piece of legislation.

Let me go on with the fact sheets.

"Fact: Truck accidents cause enormous economic costs. A study of the Los Angeles freeway system reported that

economic costs of truck accidents amounted to \$190 million a year." That is the Los Angeles freeway area alone.

"Fact: Trucks do have blind spots; ie, a truck turning from the second lane cannot see a motor vehicle in its right-hand blind spot and can crush that vehicle as has already happened on occasions.

"Fact: In a 1989 spring safety blitz conducted by the provincial government, inspectors took 20% (one in every five) of the trucks" they investigated on the road "out of service for serious"—not minor—"safety violations."

This is the industry, these are the vehicles this minister wants to increase in length and put on our highways? I think there is an awful lot of answering to be done before we allow this to go through this House and I would hope that the minister and the committee that this bill will be referred to are not the kind of a rubber stamp we have become so used to in this particular period of government. That would be a tragedy. Some of the government members may say, "Hey, we don't agree with that," but certainly the evidence is clear. On most of the major bills that have been referred to a committee, the members have had their marching orders and there has been little change based on any input from the citizens or the people who appear before the committee.

I want to deal with another letter that went to the Minister of Transportation. It is one that was sent just two weeks before the 15 December letter that my colleague the member for Nickel Belt quoted from when he was speaking to this particular bill. This also is from the Hamilton Automobile Club. It is signed by Alfred Oakie, who recently retired from his job of many years as head of the Hamilton Automobile Club. He was a tremendous person. I have known him ever since I came to Hamilton in 1963. He was one of the real fighters for protection of drivers and one of the real opponents of this piece of legislation which the minister has now brought into this Legislature. I want to put his letter on record because I think it also invites a number of questions of this minister:

"December 5, 1989

"Dear Mr Wrye:

"Again, we acknowledge your courtesy in receiving Mr Eatson, Mr Laviolette and myself at the meeting with you and your staff on November 9, 1989.

"Consequently, we must express a sharp note of disappointment in your announcement a mere two weeks later that you would be considering an increase to 25 metres for trucks in Ontario. This simply underlines the skilful manner in which some of the major trucking companies, through their trucking association, are able to sound so convincing. We have dealt with them for a good many years and are quite familiar with their patterns of persuasiveness.

"The fact is that the circumstances have not altered one bit since the cabinet made a decision in February of 1988 not to permit the 25-metre trucks on our highways. The Honourable Mr Fulton reaffirmed cabinet's position in a letter to us dated June 20, 1989. In early October 1989, you publicly reaffirmed the lengths would not be increased."

It does beg the question, what happened in a matter of a couple of weeks? Did the minister somehow or other stop and talk to hundreds or thousands of drivers, the vast majority of whom would have said no to this legislation, or did a handful of trucking company executives get to him and convince him to change what he had made as a commitment to the automobile club just two weeks earlier? I think that is a legitimate question and not a nasty question. It is one that obviously has to be asked. The minister is not listening to the thousands; he certain-

ly was listening to a very small number. I ask the minister, what did they offer to get his support?

Hon Mr Wrye: Careful. Be very careful.

Mr Mackenzie: I do not need to be careful. The minister is the one who has to answer for this. Two weeks before, he told the auto club there would be no increase in the lengths. He did not talk to the drivers, but he did obviously talk to the trucking industry; not thousands of drivers in Ontario, not the automobile club and not their executive members who met with him. But all of a sudden he changed his position, and the trucking companies' views, not even those of the trucking companies' drivers, were what carried the day.

Let me go over that paragraph:

"The fact is that the circumstances have not altered one bit since the cabinet made a decision in February of 1988 not to permit the 25-metre trucks on our highways."

It is not my letter. This is from Alf Oakie of the Hamilton Automobile Club.

Let me suggest also that the circumstances have not changed one bit since our highway safety committee made the same recommendation against increasing the length back in 1977-78, an all-party committee reporting unanimously out of this Legislature.

"The Honourable Mr Fulton reaffirmed cabinet's position in a letter to us dated June 20, 1989. In early October, you"—referring to this minister—"publicly reaffirmed the lengths would not be increased." What happened almost overnight?

"Truckers claim that this increased length was merely for safety purposes. Somehow there is a contradiction when the trailer portion is going from 48 to 53 feet. The fact is that the determined stance of the truckers that this is to improve safety, with greater stability of the tractor portion, is a fallacious and redundant argument. When I served on the Uffen commission under Dr Bob Uffen, we recognized the stability of cab-behind-the-engine versus cab-over-engine, and consequently we agreed that the truck lengths should be increased from 21 to 23 metres to provide for safety factors"—permitting an increase from 21 to 23, not for the 25—"but without permitting an increase in the trailer size. The trucking association's stance"—this is the letter; I am reading it to members verbatim—"that there are no economic benefits and that only safety is their concern is extremely hard to swallow when one considers how the increase in length is being utilized."

1750

Mr Miller: No, it isn't. Safety is our number one priority; safety first.

Mr Mackenzie: I did not know the member disagreed so strongly with Mr Oakie, but nevertheless.

"We gave you a copy"—I am quoting further from the letter verbatim—"of various research reports and studies conducted over the years. All of them indicate clearly that we cannot allow trucks to get bigger. On the Uffen commission, we had truckers, myself representing the motorists, police, a truck driver training school representative, a medical doctor and others representing various disciplines including the government. I should add the Teamsters were also represented. The Teamsters from the standpoint of their members' safety were opposed to increases in truck lengths. The police were opposed to it from the standpoint of critical accidents on our highways and safety; the medical representative, Dr Green, was opposed to it because he had to deal with the trauma from such accidents. All these agencies are still opposed to any increase in truck lengths. You will

no doubt be hearing from some of them. Municipal engineers who appeared at the Uffen hearings pointed out that even with 21-metre lengths permitted on urban streets, they contributed substantially to congestion, road damage and difficulties in moving traffic. Adding four more metres to that original 21 metres will pose serious problems for urban areas. They simply cannot cope with longer trucks. We recently had a call from a person whose wife experienced a terrifying accident involving a truck making a right-hand turn from the second lane, crushing her on to the sidewalk. The fact is these trucks have a blind spot on the right-hand side and they cannot see a car. Trucks making left-hand turns at intersections in municipalities need two and three lanes to complete the movement and this ties up lanes of traffic. The alternative is to run their wheels over the sidewalk curbs causing damage and possible injury to pedestrians."

I think the letter—I say this seriously to all members of this House—is a devastating one, an indictment of the move this minister has made.

"Recently we did an examination of the truck density per kilometre of provincial highways in each province and Ontario has such a high density of trucks versus other provinces to make such comparisons a mockery. Quebec only has 7.7 trucks per kilometre of highway and Ontario has 46.3." That is six and a half times.

"We have received numerous calls from concerned motorists and in fact, even from those who have had some experience in the trucking industry. All the calls we have had from people who have been employed in the past or are currently employed in the trucking industry, have expressed deep concern about the increase to 25 metres. Their concerns reflect their experience, having worked in the industry. There is concern expressed that this is the thin edge of the wedge and there will be ongoing movement by the industry to keep increasing the size of trucks. We are quite familiar with this pattern and that is why it is essential to stop them at the 23 metres. Small trucking companies cannot afford to change their equipment to be competitive. Consequently the only ones that will benefit are a few large trucking companies and possibly some shippers, to the detriment of small trucking companies and to the motorists at large.

"I guess we are also very concerned about the very blatant statement made in the Toronto Star by a trucking company representative, 'We are happy the minister is a friend of the truckers.' The question millions of motorists will be asking is, 'Where does that place the minister as the representative of the motorists and the ordinary citizens of Ontario?'" The remark I made earlier, which seemed to catch the ire of the minister, is just a direct reflection of that piece in the Toronto Star.

Hundreds of thousands of drivers: I doubt if the minister can find very many who agree with this legislation. Most of the truckers themselves do not agree with it, so he has a very tiny constituency, the major trucking companies. To see this kind of statement in the Star by the trucking industry, "We are happy the minister is a friend of the truckers," does beg the question of what made him do the sudden about-face in a period of less than two weeks. What was the price of this change and who the blazes in this province is speaking up for the drivers of Ontario who, I am totally convinced, do not want the longer trucks on the highways?

Continuing with the letter to the minister: "At a safety research conference I attended some three years ago in the United States, the technical director for one of the large trucking companies demonstrated the weakness of the air brake system on trucks. When he concluded with his presentation accompanied

by illustrations, I asked him point-blank, 'You mean we should be more worried than we are right now?' His response was, 'You should be terrified.' Braking efficiency of the trucks are in doubt and stopping distances are much higher than for cars. When you have this combination in play dynamically on 12-foot laneways on our congested highways, it's a formula for disaster." That is not my comment. Once again, that is the comment and the response by a trucking official to Alf Oakie, at the time head of the biggest single automobile club in this country.

"No matter from what angle we examine it, it just does not make sense to permit trucks to become larger. The fact is that the trucking industry in Ontario is probably the healthiest in Canada and they have done it with 21- and 23-metre trucks. If Ontario had larger lengths than permitted in other jurisdictions, then the truckers would face a problem, but the fact is they can travel anywhere, except the Maritimes, with total freedom." Once again, what is the economic benefit? If anything, the benefit is the other way, if we do not increase the lengths, because we at least have some protection in the province of Ontario for our trucking industry.

It goes on to say: "Mr Wrye, I sincerely hope that all of the information we have provided to you, including that provided to your predecessor, will be given thorough study. Pat Jacobsen has promised me she would read some of our material which is replete with substantial evidence that longer truckers in Ontario are simply not viable. When we put the statement in a debate with Mr Cope on radio, that the issue was dollars versus lives, he argued that it was a safety matter and returned to the redundant argument that this will provide for more stable tractors. We did take care of that and we would urge you to please not allow him to use that redundant argument to support 25-metre lengths.

"We will be urging motorists to write to you and we sincerely hope that based on their personal experiences and personal concerns, supported by all the research we've done, that you will reconsider this decision for the benefit of the major users of our highways, particularly the motorists who contribute

to the vast proportion of the taxes to build our roads and highways.

"Sincerely yours,

"Hamilton Automobile Club,

"Alfred U. Oakie,

"Spokesman for government affairs,

"CAA-Ontario."

As I said, that is not my letter and it is a letter from a very well respected gentleman. Some of the members were at the retirement dinner for him in the city of Hamilton recently. He has spent a lifetime arguing the cause and the case of motorists in the province of Ontario.

That letter and a further letter I could go to, a letter to members of the assembly of Ontario that they sent out, outline so strongly and so positively the fact that the benefits are not there, that the dangers are there, that the costs are there to our towns, our municipalities, our roads and to our people in terms of accidents, deaths, injuries, trauma, the mental and psychological trauma of older people, particularly in smaller cars competing with ever longer trucks on the road.

There was the fear, almost the terror I felt coming back from Winnipeg on that drive in slushy, snowy and wet weather, trying to go around the trucks or having the trucks pass me and the big splash of slush up on the windows; and I am not driving a larger car, so I suppose I am doubly at risk as well.

That says to me, as does the fact that we are not seeing any kind of campaign or support from drivers in this province—at least if there is, it is invisible to me. I am going to be very interested in having the minister tell us how many ordinary drivers agree with this legislation. The fact that the drivers themselves, the truckers, and their organization, the Teamsters, have not agreed with it once again narrows it down to a very tiny constituency.

On motion by Mr Mackenzie, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1800.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

Second Session, 34th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Allen, Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	
Ballinger, William G.	Durham-York	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Beer, Hon Charles	York North	L	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Black, Hon Kenneth H.	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	L	Minister of Tourism and Recreation, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Bossy, Maurice L.	Chatham-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Bradley, Hon James J.	St Catharines	L	Minister of the Environment
Brandt, Andrew S.	Sarnia	PC	
Breaugh, Michael J.	Oshawa	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	
Bryden, Marion	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	L	
Campbell, Sterling	Sudbury	L	
Caplan, Hon Elinor	Oriole	L	Minister of Health
Carrothers, Douglas A.	Oakville South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	L	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Collins, Hon Shirley	Wentworth East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for disabled persons
Conway, Hon Sean G.	Renfrew North	L	Minister of Education, Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Cooke, David R.	Kitchener	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Cooke, David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	House leader
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Cureatz, Sam L.	Durham East	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Dietsch, Michael M.	St Catharines-Brock	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Eakins, John F.	Victoria-Haliburton	L	
Edighoffer, Hon Hugh A.	Perth	L	Speaker
Elliot, R. Walter	Halton North	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Elston, Hon Murray J.	Bruce	L	Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Financial Institutions
Epp, Herbert A.	Waterloo North	L	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Michael	Cambridge	NDP	
Faubert, Frank	Scarborough-Ellesmere	L	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ferraro, Rick E.	Guelph	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Fleet, David	High Park-Swansea	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Fontaine, Hon René	Cochrane North	L	Minister of Northern Development
Fulton, Ed	Scarborough East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Furlong, Allan W.	Durham Centre	L	
Grandmaitre, Bernard C.	Ottawa East	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Grier, Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	
Haggerty, Ray	Niagara South	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	NDP	
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Hart, Christine E.	York East	L	
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Hošek, Chaviva	Oakwood	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Johnson, Jack	Wellington	PC	
Johnston, Richard F.	Scarborough West	NDP	
Kanter, Ron	St Andrew-St Patrick	L	
Kerrio, Vincent G.	Niagara Falls	L	
Keyes, Kenneth A.	Kingston and The Islands	L	Parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kozyra, Taras B.	Port Arthur	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Kwinter, Hon Monte	Wilson Heights	L	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	
LeBourdais, Linda	Etobicoke West	L	
Leone, Laureano	Downsview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Lipsett, Ron	Grey	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Lupusella, Tony	Dovercourt	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
MacDonald, Keith	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	L	
Mackenzie, Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	L	
Mancini, Hon Remo	Essex South	L	Minister of Revenue
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	
Matrundola, Gino	Willowdale	L	
McCague, George R.	Simcoe West	PC	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	L	
McGuigan, James F.	Essex-Kent	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Hon Lyn.	Fort William	L	Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	
Miller, Gordon I.	Norfolk	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Morin, Hon Gilles E.	Carleton East	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Morin-Strom, Karl E.	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	
Neumann, David E.	Brantford	L	
Nicholas, Cindy	Scarborough Centre	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Nixon, J. Bradford	York Mills	L	
Nixon, Hon Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	L	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics
Oddie Munro, Lily	Hamilton Centre	L	
Offer, Hon Steven	Mississauga North	L	Solicitor General
O'Neil, Hon Hugh P.	Quinte	L	Minister of Mines, Minister of Culture and Communications

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	
Owen, Bruce	Simcoe Centre	L	
Patten, Hon Richard	Ottawa Centre	L	Minister of Correctional Services
Pelissero, Harry E.	Lincoln	L	
Peterson, Hon David R.	London Centre	L	Premier, President of the Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Philip, Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	
Phillips, Hon Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	Minister of Labour
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	L	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Pollock, Jim	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	
Polsinelli, Claudio	Yorkview	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for senior citizens' affairs
Pope, Alan W.	Cochrane South	PC	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Bob	York South	NDP	Leader of the Official Opposition
Ramsay, Hon David	Timiskaming	L	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Ray, Michael C.	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Reville, David	Riverdale	NDP	Chief whip
Reycraft, Douglas R.	Middlesex	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics
Riddell, Jack	Huron	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Roberts, Marietta L. D.	Elgin	L	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Scott, Hon Ian G.	St George-St David	L	Attorney General
Smith, David W.	Lambton	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Smith, E. Joan	London South	L	Chief government whip
Sola, John	Mississauga East	L	
Sorbara, Hon Gregory S.	York Centre	L	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
South, Larry	Frontenac-Addington	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stoner, Norah	Durham West	L	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	L	
Sweeney, Hon John	Kitchener-Wilmot	L	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Tatham, Charlie	Oxford	L	
Velshi, Murad	Don Mills	L	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Chief whip
Ward, Hon Christopher C.	Wentworth North	L	Minister of Government Services, government House leader
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	NDP	
Wilson, Hon Mavis	Dufferin-Peel	L	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Wiseman, Douglas J.	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Wong, Hon Robert C.	Fort York	L	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for multiculturalism, minister responsible for race relations
Wrye, Hon William	Windsor-Sandwich	L	Minister of Transportation
Vacant	Ottawa South		

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Robert Chiarelli

Vice-chair: Carman McClelland

Members: David R. Cooke, Howard Hampton, Ron Kanter, Peter Kormos, Cindy Nicholas, Claudio Polsinelli, Robert W. Runciman, David W. Smith and Norman W. Sterling

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Estimates

Chair: George R. McCague

Vice-chair: W. Donald Cousens

Members: Brian A. Charlton, John C. Cleary, David R. Cooke, James D. Henderson, Gino Matrondola, Frank Miclash, Ed Philip, Marietta L. D. Roberts, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Harold Brown

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Steven W. Mahoney

Vice-chair: Frank Faubert

Members: Dianne E. Cunningham, Hans Daigeler, Rick E. Ferraro, Ray Haggerty, Chaviva Hošek, Floyd Laughren, Allan K. McLean, Karl E. Morin-Strom and Douglas Reycraft

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

General government

Chair: Harry E. Pelissero

Vice-chair: Linda LeBourdais

Members: Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, Brian A. Charlton, Allan W. Furlong, James F. McGuigan, J. Bradford Nixon, Robert W. Runciman, John Sola, Murad Velshi and Douglas J. Wiseman

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Government agencies

Chair: Norman W. Sterling

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: Michael Farnan, Ed Fulton, Ruth A. Grier, Taras B. Kozyra, Tony Lupusella, J. Bradford Nixon, Bruce Owen, Alan W. Pope and Larry South

Clerk: Harold Brown

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Herbert A. Epp

Vice-chair: Michael C. Ray

Members: Michael J. Breaugh, Michael A. Brown, Sterling Campbell, Sam L. Cureatz, John F. Eakins, Michael Farnan, Jack Johnson, Vincent G. Kerrio and Barbara Sullivan

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Ombudsman

Chair: Murad Velshi

Vice-chair: Ron Kanter

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Marion Bryden, Douglas A. Carrothers, David R. Cooke, W. Donald Cousens, D. James Henderson, Keith MacDonald, Ed Philip and Jim Pollock

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Ed Philip

Vice-chair: Gilles Pouliot

Members: Peter Adams, William G. Ballinger, Joseph Cordiano, W. Donald Cousens, Alvin Curling, Michael D.

Harris, Laureano Leone, Shelley Martel and Dianne Poole
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-chair: Lily Oddie Munro

Members: Maurice L. Bossy, Cameron Jackson, Ron Kanter, Keith MacDonald, Bob Mackenzie, Shelley Martel, Jim Pollock, Tony Ruprecht and Charlie Tatham

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Resources development

Chair: Floyd Laughren

Vice-chair: Bob Mackenzie

Members: Michael M. Dietsch, David Fleet, Michael D. Harris, Ron Lipsett, Margaret Marland, Gordon I. Miller, Jack Riddell and Bud Wildman

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

Social development

Chair: Yvonne O'Neill

Vice-chair: David E. Neumann

Members: Richard Allen, Dianne E. Cunningham, R. Walter Elliot, Joan M. Fawcett, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes and Norah Stoner

Clerk: Todd Decker

SELECT COMMITTEES

Constitutional and intergovernmental affairs

Chair: Allan W. Furlong

Members: Richard Allen, Michael J. Breaugh, Herbert A. Epp, Ernie L. Eves, Bernard C. Grandmaître, Michael D. Harris, Chaviva Hošek, Lily Oddie Munro, Claudio Polsinelli and Marietta L. D. Roberts

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Education

Chair: Sterling Campbell

Vice-chair: Frank Miclash

Members: David S. Cooke, Allan W. Furlong, Cameron Jackson, Richard F. Johnston, Kenneth A. Keyes, Steven W. Mahoney, Margaret Marland, Yvonne O'Neill and Dianne Poole

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Energy

Chair: Barbara Sullivan

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Robert V. Callahan, Brian A. Charlton, David R. Cooke, Sam L. Cureatz, Ruth A. Grier, Vincent G. Kerrio, James F. McGuigan, Jim Pollock and Michael C. Ray

Clerk: Todd Decker

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary precinct

Co-chairs: Hon Hugh A. Edighoffer and Herbert A. Epp

Members: Gilles Pouliot, E. Joan Smith and Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Tuesday 5 June 1990

Members' statements

Northern communities	1527
Mr Laughren	
Environmental protection	1527
Mrs Marland	
Invitation to Kingston	1527
Mr South	
Fertilizer plant feasibility study	1527
Miss Martel	
Sustainable development	1528
Mr Jackson	
Landlords' restrictions on pets	1528
Mr Faubert	
Highway construction	1528
Mr Mackenzie	
Zebra mussels	1528
Mr Villeneuve	
Water safety	1528
Mr Owen	

Oral questions

Job security	1529
Mr D. S. Cooke	
Mr Kwinter	
Political contributions	1529
Mr Philip	
Mr Black	
Homes for the aged	1530
Mr Harris	
Mr Beer	
Health cards	1531
Mr Harris	
Mrs Caplan	
Waste disposal	1532
Mr Morin-Strom	
Mr Fontaine	
Support services for students	1532
Mr Jackson	
Mr Conway	
Decentralization of government services	1532
Mr Adams	
Mr Ward	
Energy efficiency	1533
Mr Charlton	
Mrs McLeod	
Local government accountability	1534
Mr Cousens	
Mr Sweeney	
Protection of trees	1534
Mr Faubert	
Mr Sweeney	
Water quality	1535
Mrs Grier	
Mrs Caplan	
Ministry of Natural Resources staff day	1535
Mr Jackson	
Mrs McLeod	

Pay equity	1536
Ms Oddie Munro	
Mr Phillips	
Automobile insurance	1536
Mr Wildman	
Mr Elston	

Petitions

Municipal reorganization	1537
Mr Wildman	
Religious education	1537
Miss Roberts	
Elections	1537
Mr McLean	
Landfill site	1537
Mr Pollock	

First readings

St. George's Society of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr90	1537
Mr Reville	
Agreed to	1537
Assessment Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 176	1537
Mr Mancini	
Agreed to	1537
City of Mississauga Act, 1990, Bill Pr78	1537
Mrs Marland	
Agreed to	1537
AXA Home Insurance Company Act, 1990, Bill Pr69	1537
Ms Poole	
Agreed to	1538
Town of Simcoe Act, 1990, Bill Pr66	1538
Mr Miller	
Agreed to	1538

Second reading

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1989, Bill 96	1538
Mr Wrye	1538
Mr Pouliot	1539
Mr Wiseman	1546
Mr McLean	1548
Mr Laughren	1548
Mr Cousens	1551
Mr Mackenzie	1553
Adjourned	1557

Other business

Adjournment	1557
------------------------------	------

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1558
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1561

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mardi 5 juin 1990

Question orale

Dépôts des déchets 1532
M. Fontaine

Deuxième lecture

Loi de 1989 modifiant la Loi sur le code de la route,
Projet de loi 96 1538
M. Pouliot 1539

025240043

NOV 9 1990

